

The Classical Review

MARCH 1891.

THE BEARING OF THE NEW PAPYRUS ON SOME CARDINAL POINTS IN TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

It would be difficult to overrate the importance of the new papyrus in its relations to textual criticism; and if, as seems possible, other papyri rolls of some size and of an early date are discovered, the results are certain to be momentous.

In what I shall say for the present, I shall confine myself to the direct evidence furnished by the papyrus in regard to certain points of view to which, as readers of this magazine may be aware, I have been brought by lines of inquiry entirely different and supplying evidence only of an indirect kind.

In the first place, the papyrus furnishes much confirmatory evidence of the position that very many of the difficulties in the texts of Greek authors have been produced *at quite an early date* by the mechanical incorporation of different species of adscripts explanatory of the text. I had been led to take this view by evidence derived from the corpus of 'scholia' on Aristophanes; and since the publication of my edition of the Fourth Book of Thucydides Wilamowitz-Moellendorf in his 'Herakles' has also given expression to a like belief in the value of the same corpus of 'scholia.' Indeed I should not be surprised if Dobree's very near approach to the point of view here referred to was due to his studies in the 'scholia' of Aristophanes, which, however, he did not carry very far. It often happens that there is just enough evidence left in the 'scholia' to prove that sometimes what is now written as part of the text of Aristophanes

was once a note or notes written on the margin or between the lines; and again, the corpus of 'scholia' furnishes us in abundance with the commonest types of such adscripts and makes us familiar with their peculiar characteristics so that we can trace their analogues in texts other than that of Aristophanes. Once more, if we can demonstrate the presence in Aristophanes of adscripts twisted into metrical form, we get strong presumptive proof that this sort of corruption must be very common in prose texts where no metrical rules have to be first satisfied before an adscript takes its place in the body of the work.

There is no lack of Aristophanic examples of this process, but I shall give for the present only one. It happens to be as instructive as any, and seeing that it turned up only a few weeks ago I can treat it in detail though now at a distance from my books and notes. In the *Birds*, ll. 1148 ff. we read:

καὶ νῆ Δί' αἱ νῆτταί γε περιέλωσμέναι
ἐπλυθοφόρου· ἀνοὶ δὲ τὸν ὑπαγωγέα
ἐπέτοντ' ἔχουσαι κατόπιν ὥσπερ παιδία
τὸν πηλὸν ἐν τοῖς στόμασιν αἱ χελιδόνες.

All kinds of remedies have been suggested in order to get sense out of these lines, but none has served its purpose. Yet the explanation is easy and can hardly fail to be accepted if once stated. From ὥσπερ παιδία to στόμασιν we have a series of three adscripts, all of them of the most grotesque description. They are as follows:—

1. ἔχουσαι κατὰ παῖν : βασιάζουσαι ὥσπερ παιδία.
2. τὸν ὑπαγωγέα : τὸν πηλόν.
3. ἔχουσαι : ἐν τοῖς στόμασιν.

It would be a long business to write out all the evidence from scholiasts and lexicographers for the existence at a very early date of such a variant as κατὰ παῖν for κατόπιν in this passage, and for the gloss τὸν πηλόν [itself, as Dobree pointed out, a mistake for τὸν πύλον] as an explanation of τὸν ὑπαγωγέα. It is enough for our present purpose to show how easily and instructively we can restore by this means the original reading :

καὶ νῆ Δεῖ αἱ νῆτται γε περιεζωμένοι
ἐπλινθοφόρον· ἄνω δὲ τὸν ὑπαγωγέα
ἐπέοντ' ἔχουσαι κατόπιν αἱ χελιδόνες.

Indeed I believe that I already possess material sufficient to prove, as far as the nature of the case admits, that this sort of corruption had already seriously affected the texts of the great Attic writers at a time considerably earlier than the Christian era. But if many early papyri are discovered such academic proof may soon become precise demonstration. As it is, this one new papyrus brings us some definite evidence. In the line of Solon quoted on p. 31 it restores to us one line which before we only knew in a corrupt form due to the ousting of one participle *φυγόντας* by what is really an adscript (*λέγοντας*) to the *λέντας* which occurs in the following line. This seems to have escaped the editor, though he has noted at least one case in which the papyrus furnishes this kind of evidence viz. p. 2 where τὸν δῆμον can only be explained as an adscript to τὸ πλῆθος. There are, however, other passages in which we have more or less certain adscripits. I shall take these as they come in order of paging : p. 7. ἐτι καὶ νῦν γὰρ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως γυναικὸς ἡ σύμμιξις ἐνταῦθα γίνεται τῷ Διονύσῳ καὶ ὁ γάμος, where ὁ γάμος is a gloss on ἡ σύμμιξις : p. 20. καὶ παρέστηκεν ἵππος ἐκμαρτυρῶν ὡς τὴν ἱππάδα τοῦτο σημα.νουσ.ν. This is a very odd sort of note and may even be due to the scribe of this particular papyrus. In any case it was originally intended to explain the gloss ἵππον found at one time as an adscript to ἱππάδ'.

ἵππον : θητικοῦ ἀντὶ τέλους ἱππάδ' ἀμειψάμενος.

Accordingly we have to restore the second lost letter of the second verb as iota and not

as alpha, viz. σημαίνουσιν—so that the note becomes 'ἵππος stands at the side (of the line) showing that they take ἱππάδα in this sense' : p. 27. the words ἦν δ' ὁ ἀρχαῖος χαρακτήρ διδραχμον has most likely arisen from an adscript to νόμισμα : p. 53. in the sentence διὰ μὲν οὖν ταύτας τὰς αἰτίας ἐπίστευον ὁ δῆμος τῷ Κλεισθένι the plural ἐπίστευον is probably right, and ὁ δῆμος an adscript : p. 57. either τῇ βοῦλῃ or τοῖς πεντακοσίοις is an adscript : p. 93. ἐκ τῶν χυλίων is an adscript to ἐκ προκρίτων : p. 113. in the sentence τηρεῖ δ' οὗτος τὰς τε κλῆς (*lege* κλεῖς) τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἐν οἷς τὰ χρήματ' ἐστὶν καὶ γράμματα τῇ πόλει either a perfect participle has been lost after ἐστὶν or else τῇ πόλει is an adscript to τηρεῖ : p. 138. as on p. 57, τοῖς φ. is an adscript to τῇ βουλῇ : p. 148. ἐλαίαν is an adscript to μορίαν in the sentence καὶ εἰ τις ἐξορύξειεν ἐλαίαν μορίαν ἢ κατάξειεν κ.τ.λ. : p. 157. both τοῦ ἐνδεκάτου and τοῦ τριακοστοῦ are adscripits to τοῦ λ.

Secondly, the papyrus provides a convincing explanation of a very puzzling fact in all texts of ancient authors, while some features of the *editio princeps* itself serve admirably to illustrate the process by which the kind of corruption with which I now mean to deal reached its present gigantic proportions.

How is it that in reading an ancient author we often find hundreds of lines together which present no very great difficulty, and yet come across every now and then a page or two which bristle with every sort of obscurity? This papyrus supplies the answer. A roll of this description (and at one time all ancient books took the form of rolls) is liable to peculiar risks. In the case of a manuscript in book form, it is the first page only that as a rule gets frayed and rubbed. But with a roll it is altogether different. The long under-edge (if we can use the expression) on which the roll rests is the part of a papyrus which is most likely to get frayed and rubbed, and this long under-edge is almost certain to coincide with a line broader or narrower drawn through a column of the writing from top to bottom. In this way it may happen that at a particular point in every line of a whole column the letters are partially or entirely rubbed. The long upper-edge of the roll may be just as ill off in regard to rubbing, supposing more rolls than one to be kept in the same case, so that another vertical row of letters may again be more or less rubbed away. Nor does the rubbing necessarily affect only the outer fold of the roll; it may affect more than one fold. Further, there is no means of telling at what

point in any treatise this sort of corruption is to be looked for, for the new papyrus shows that a roll may begin and end quite irrespective of any natural division in the subject-matter.

In this way we can explain quite adequately the seeming perversity with which corruption appears to show itself in our texts, as affecting more particularly certain parts of a book as against others. But, as I have said, the new *editio princeps* actually illustrates with singular lucidity another important moment in this process of corruption which arises in the last resort from a characteristic of the roll form of a book. We are provided not with one or two examples, but with many examples of the way in which a well-known class of difficulties has been produced. Indeed it would be very difficult to imagine any more effectual means of demonstrating even to unskilled persons the risk of corruption attending any uncautious effort to replace lost letters, words, and phrases. To such uncautious attempts I have given in my edition of the fourth book of Thucydides the name of stop-gaps, but I never could have believed that the extent to which such corruption may have gone would ever be so well illustrated as is the case in the new *editio princeps*. Let me give a list of some of the aberrations from probability or from Greek usage thus imported into Aristotle's text: p. 6, ἄρχειν for ἄρξειν; *id.* καὶ ἐγένετο δὴ; p. 16, ὡς δ' οἱ [κεκτη]μένοι βλασφημεῖν; p. 25, [ἀποστάν]τας τὸ αὐτόματον; *id.* μ[ὴ] αἰρ[ε]ται (*sic*) for μ[ὴ] ἔλ[η]ται; p. 27, [ἐ]χ[η] [ὁ δῆμος κ]ύριος for [ἐ]χ[η] [τὸν δῆμον κ]ύριον; *id.* ποιήσα[σθαι] τὴν χρ[ε]ω[ν] ἀποκοπήν for ποιήσα[ι] τὴν τῶν χρ[ε]ω[ν] ἀποκοπήν; *id.* [μὲν ἔχου]σα for [μὲν ἀγο]υσα; p. 42, [φωνῇ δ' ἐξεκλήσ]αθεν μικρόν; p. 44, πα[τ]ράλῳ for πα[λαιόν]; *id.* τὸν πα[τ]ταλον for τὸν πα[λαιόν]; *id.* [ἐρ]εσθαι (*sic*); *id.* p. 45, διδ[ω]ς (*sic*) καὶ ποτ[ε]; εἰάν [τιν]ες τυραννεῖν ἐπανίστω[ν]ται [ἢ] ἐπὶ τυραννίδι τι[ς] κ.τ.λ. in a passage probably corrupted already by the incorporation of adscripts; p. 105 [ἐξ]έχουσα πολιτείας τάξιν for [παρ]έχουσα πολιτείας τάξιν; p. 122, [οἷτινες α]ἰτῇ δοκῶσιν for [οἷτινες ἀν] αἰτῇ δοκῶσιν; p. 143, ὁ δῆμ[ος] ἐχ[ειροτόν]ει for ὁ δῆμ[ος] χ[ειροτόν]ει; p. 145 [αἰτίαν προσ]λαβῇ (*sic*) κτεῖναι for [. ἀπο]κτεῖναι.

Together with these we may take some of the more eccentric words which the editor suggests as possible in cases where some of

the characters are still visible, or where some other uncertainty of reading appears: p. 14, ἐπῆλυνεν; p. 27, τρεῖς καὶ; p. 103, καρδία for καὶ ἰδία; p. 109, συμμυγεῖν; p. 125, ἐν τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ τείχους for ἐντὸς τῆς περιόδου τοῦ τείχους.

But that the writers of the papyrus text itself found like difficulties inherent in their task is only too palpable, and may be demonstrated by a study of what the editor tells us in regard to the example last given, and by other indications. Moreover, it is also plain that many words required by the context do not appear in the papyrus at all. Sometimes the editor has noticed these, and where he has noticed them has, as a rule, supplied them with judgment, though in one case (p. 101) he makes a sentence quite untranslatable: εἰ τίς τινα αὐτοχειρὶ ἀπέκτο-
νεν > ἐκτίσει ἱερώσας. The following lacunae he has not remarked: p. 20, ἐπειδὴν ἔρηται <τις>; p. 25, μηδὲ μεθ' ἑτέρων < >, where the word to be supplied is perhaps συστή; p. 43, ἀλλ' ἀπελθόντας ἐπὶ < > τῶν ἰδίων < >, where we should perhaps read ἐπὶ οἴκον τῶν ἰδίων ἐπιμελεῖσθαι; p. 45, ἐπεφύκει καλῶς < >; p. 65, πορίσασα < >, where we should perhaps read πορισαμένη ἀργύριον; p. 67, παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἄρχειν for παρ' αὐτοῖς <ἐχεν> καὶ ἄρχειν; p. 68, a participle is lost after ἀγούσαι; p. 116, read καὶ τοῦ <τὴν ἐκκλησίαν> ἀφίεσθαι; p. 122, for ἡ μὴ θελουσι μένειν read ἡ μὴ θέλουσι <δυνα> μέν<ους>; p. 127, read τοὺς ἑνδεκα κληρωτοὺς <τοὺς> ἐπιμελησομένους.

Lastly, the papyrus is a notable discovery for the history of textual criticism because it supports at every point the main contention of one school of critics—that certain definable kinds of constructions were foreign to the Greek idiom of the great period, and have been introduced into our texts through carelessness or ignorance in the transcribers of them. If in a fairly early copy even of an Aristotelian (I use the word advisedly) treatise, we have—except in doubtful readings and the editor's *additamenta*—no violation of certain great main rules of Greek grammar, then we may safely give our adherence to some well-known principles of criticism enunciated by the older English school and the more recent Dutch school of Greek scholarship.

W. G. RUTHERFORD.

OVIDIANA.

I. *Notes on the Heroides*. 1. NOTES ON THE CODEX PARISINUS (No. 8242: olim Puteaneus).—Happening to be in Paris in August 1889 I preferred the National Library to the attractions of the Eiffel Tower, and carefully inspected this famous MS. *En passant* I would recommend scholars who find time heavy on their hands in Paris, and value a fine cheerful room to work in, perfect civility from officials, and an excellent luncheon including wine at the cost of two francs, to frequent the National Library if they have not already learned to do so. The MS. P had been much used and partially collated by N. Heinsius, and by Jahn, first carefully collated by H. Keil for Merkel, by two friends for Sedlmayer, lastly by Ehwald, who seems to have used a more accurate collation of Keil's than Merkel did, or else to have used the same one which Merkel did but more accurately. At any rate I must warn students of the *Heroides* that Sedlmayer's and Ehwald's collations of P are the only collations to be trusted. For instance the well known lines VII. 45, 46—*Non egosum tanti—quid non censeris inique?*

Ut pereas, dum me per freta longa fugis—are so given, and rightly given by P. There is not a shadow of a doubt about P having *censeris*: the only letter that is at all obscure is the *n*. Yet Heinsius tells us P has *terreris*: Merkel that P has *mereris* with the first syllable uncertain. Hence a host of conjectures have been built upon the sand, such as *quanti tu reris* of Heinsius, *quid nos metiris* of Madvig, *quid enim verearis* of Riese. There is not in my opinion a sounder reading in the *Heroides* than *quid non censeris*, which I am glad that I read in my edition of 1874 although then in ignorance that it had the support of P, as well as that of inferior MSS. Sedlmayer and Ehwald have recorded P rightly.

Again in III. 48:

Vidi consortes pariter generisque necisque
Tres cecidisse: tribus, quae mihi, mater erat.

So P: and so vulgo. Merkel states that P has *quae mea*, leading me astray. Sedlmayer and Ehwald are right.

In II. 62:

Quaecumque e merito spes venit aequa venit.

Here however Merkel is right. He says quite truly that P has *de merito*. Sedlmayer says that P has *est* ma. pr.: *ex* ma. 2. The latter statement is true: the former erroneous. P ma. pr. has *de*. Ehwald has no note.

III. 136:

Sic eat auspiciis Pyrrhus ad arma tuis. Merkel states that P has *tuis patris* for *tuis*. Sedlmayer that P has *tuis* with *patris* written over, and the second *u* in *tuis* corrected from another letter. I find *patris* certainly in the margin, but decidedly ma. rec.: and for *tuis* there is a corruption which I could not decipher, but it looked to me like *tu par* or *tu per*. Hence perhaps *puer* is the true reading. Ehwald has no note.

The usual number of lines in a page in P is 28, not 29 as stated by Merkel. Not only pp. 97 and 98 are blank, but also 55 and 56.

When Merkel (pref. p. ix.) states that there exists in P evidence of a gap at XVI. 38, where in later MSS. the spurious verses 39-142 are inserted, the student is likely to be led astray. There is no break whatever. Some reader, of uncertain date, has, as was natural, made a small mark in red ink where the spurious verses began in other MSS. i.e. after line 38: that is all.

I subjoin a few passages where P is either not reported, or reported incorrectly by Sedlmayer and Ehwald.

In IV. 138 P has *cognata* for *cognato*: not noticed by Sedlmayer or Ehwald. IV. 141 *reserenda manti* for *reseranda mariti* (not *reserenda amanti* as Sedlmayer has it: but *a* is written over *manti* ma. sec.). V. 3

Pegagis for *Pegasis*. V. 86 *qua* for *quas*. VI. 84 *face* pr. ma. for *falce*. VI. 83 *meritis* for *meritisque*, *ue* superscribed ma. rec. (not *meritisue* in one word, as Sedlm.). VI. 89 *passi* for *passis*. VI. 98 *fero sanguis* ma. pr. for *feros angues*.

VI. 118:

Me quoque dotalis inter habere potes.

The only letters of *dotalis* at all legible are *l* and *s*. There is not the smallest trace of *q* in the first letter as Merkel and Ehwald state. Sedlmayer states the whole word is illegible.

VII. 153, 4 :

Ilion in Tyriam transfer felicius urbem
 Resque loco regis sacraque sceptrum tene.
 So I now, after inspection of P, write the pentameter. In P there is some trace of the first letter which might have been R but could not have been either H or S or M : then an erasure in which however *loco* can be read.

VII. 179 :

Pro meritis et si qua tibi debemus ultra
 Pro spe coniugii tempora parva peto.
 Ehwald correctly states that P has *ultra*, which is probably the right reading. Sedlmayer attributes *ultra* to inferior MSS. only.

VIII. 32 :

At pater Aeacio promiserat, inscius acti :
 Plus quoque, qui prior est ordine, possit avus.
 P omits *qui*, but supplies it *ma. sec.* above the line. The verse ran either :
 Plus quo, quo prior est ordine, possit avus.
 or

Plus quo, qui prior est ordine, possit avus.
Plus quoque is not correct here.

VIII. 65, is thus given in P :

^{hoc} N ^t /// generis fato quod nostros eral-
 nannos.

The *t* is *ma. 2*, and the letter before *n* is too high for *i*, cannot be a *t*, is more like *l* than anything else but wants its curl.

IX. 40 *Omniaque* for *Omina que* P.

IX. 95 For *redundabat* P *ma. 1* has a corruption which looked to me like *redulabat*, which Ehwald gives as *nudulabat*, Heinsius as *elulabat*, and which Sedlmayer does not notice.

IX. 109 ^h *procedit* P : *h ma. 1*.

IX. 141 which generally appears thus—
 Semivir occubuit in letifero Eveno—

P is not correctly reported by either Sedlmayer or Ehwald. P has : *Semivir occubuit in l* /// (here the space of two, or at most three, letters in *ras.*) ^q *fero : ueneno*, over the erasure *erni ma. 2*. Bentley's *lotifero* is probably right.

X. 106 :

Strataque Cretaeam belua stravit humum.
stravit P, not in *rasura* nor *ma. 2* as Sedlmayer and Ehwald state. The letters *ui* may be a little 'inculcatae,' but *str* is clearly *ma. pr.* Of all the corrections proposed Bentley's *planxit* is the best. Cf. XVI. 334.

X. 126 :

Cum steteris urbis celsus in arce tuae.
 P has *urbes ma. pr.* changed to *urbis ma. 2*, and *t* prefixed to it by a later hand, a half correction to *turbae*. For *arce* P has *aure ma. pr.*

XII. 3 :

Tunc quae dispensant mortalia fata sorores.
 P has *facta*. XII. 17 thus appears in P : *Semina iecisset* (this word erased and *sensisset* in marg.) *totidemque & seminat &* (this erased) *hostes*. XIII. 133 : *Si* (rather than *Sed*) *quid ego reuoco ?* (the last four letters of this word 'inculcatae') : then an erasure and over it written *reuocantis et ma. sec.*, then *omen abesto*. This line very much wants emendation. Bentley's *revocaminis* is only provisional. XIV. 46. For *reccidit* P *pr.* seemed to have */// extendit*, not */// cecidit* as Sedlmayer reports.

XVI. 200 :

Cum dis potando nectare miscet aquas.
 P *pr.* had *disputando*.

XVI. 316 :

Utere mandantis simplicitate viri.
 P has *mandatis*. But I do not think *mandatis* here stands for *mandantis*. The mark over the *a* is in P often an indication of a marginal reading. And here *ma. pr.* in the margin is *l. non uafri*, which is probably the right reading.

XVI. 366 :

Instruere Atriden non potes arte mea.
non P, but *num ma. 1* in marg. the right reading, as Merkel gave.
 XVII. 234, *idiia* P sub. *ras.*, *ipsea ma. 2*.

XVII. 259 :

Aut ego deposito sapiam fortasse pudore.
 For *sapiam* I read *fajtuam* in P, *faciam* P ap. Sedlmayer, *sautiam* in *faciam ma. 2* mutatum ap. Ehwald. P has *pudorem*. Perhaps :

Aut ego deponam fatuum fortasse pudorem.

XIX. 53 : Ehwald is here right against Sedlmayer. P has *incertas ma. 2* not *incertis*.

2. SOME CONJECTURES IN OVID.

Her. II. 100 :

Expectem qui me numquam visurus abisti !
 Expectem pelago vela negata meo !

The pentameter is absurd, and P has *uela negatata meo* : but the third *a* seems corrected from *e* ; hence *negante* is an obvious correction : cf. XIII. 128 ; VII. 55. For the

last words I formerly gave *data* but *negante tamen* may be the true reading; *tamen* often ends a pentameter in Ovid. 'Expect your sails although the sea refuses them to my sight!'

III. 30-32.

Auxerunt blandas grandia dona preces,
Viginti fulvos operoso ex aere lebetas,

Et tripodas septem pondere et arte pares.
Blandas—preces has been changed to *blandae—preces* with a single inferior MS., to gain a construction, for *dona* must be in the same case as *lebetas* in 31. Yet *dona* ought surely be the nominative. Madvig seeing this went so far as to read *fulvi—lebetes* (keeping *blandas—preces*), regardless of the hiatus. I suggest:

Auxerunt blandas grandia dona preces,
Viginti *fulvi pretioso* ex aere lebetes.
or *fulvo pretiosi*. Cf. Met. I. 115: *fulvo pretiosior aere. tripodes*, of course, for *tripodas*.

VI. 3—5.

Gratulor incolumi quantum sinis; hoc tamen ipso

Debueram scripto certior esse tuo.

So (or *ipsum*) the MSS. without a legitimate construction, as far as I can see. I write:

hoc tamen ipsum

Debuerat scripto certius esse tuo.

The terminations of the comparative are confused in MSS.

VII. 77:

Quid puer Ascanius, quid di meruere Penates?

Ignibus ereptos auferet unda deos?

P omits *di*, and gives *ii* for it, but only ma. 2.: *di* the inferior MSS. But *deos* recurs at the end of the pentameter, and, if Lemaire's Index is to be trusted, *di* is not joined with *Penates* by Ovid. I write:

Quid puer Ascanius, quid commeruere Penates?

Cf. *Fast.* I. 362:

Quid bos, quid placidae commeruistis oves!

IX. 66:

Nec te Maenonia lascivae more puellae

Incingi zona dedecuisse pudet?

pudet has been commonly changed to *putas* or *putes* with Heinsius. I should prefer *patet*: cf. XVII. 32.

IX. 105:

I nunc tolle animos et fortia facta recense:

Quod tu non esses iure vir illa fuit.

quod G, quem P¹, quod P², quom Madvig.

Read: Quo tu non esses iure vir illa fuit.

'She was a man, with a title (quo iure) you could not claim' (because she conquered you). Heinsius had given *quo*, conjunction, with *foret* for *fuit*, a totally different conjecture.

XII. 80:

Per triplicis vultus arcanaque sacra Dianae
Et si forte aliquos gens habet ista deos.

I write *aequos* for *aliquos*: cf. *Fast.* VI. 766.

XIV. 103:

Quae tibi causa fugae? quid, Io, freta longa pererras?

Non poteris vultus effugere ipsa tuos.

I do not believe that Ovid shortened the

first syllable of *Io*. P has *o* (*sic*). I am inclined to believe the line ran:

Quae tibi causa fugae? frustra freta longa pererras—

that *frustra* fell out before *freta*, and that the gap was supplied by *quid Io*.

XVI. 37:

Ante tuos animo vidi quam lumine vultus:

Prima fuit vultus nuntia fama tui.

So P. But V, a fragmentary MS. of no mean character, gives *prima mihi vultus*. I think that Ovid wrote:

Prima mihi vultus nuntia fama tulit.

And this theory is borne out by the fact that the spurious verses which follow are:

Nec tamen est mirum si sicut topoteat arcu
Missilibus telis eminus ictus amo.

The interpolator chose a suitable place to insert these lines if Paris had just spoken of a wound inflicted on him by a report of Helen's beauty. Add the awkwardness of the repetition of *vultus*. Cf. XXI. 211, 2.

XVI. 111:

Addimus antennis et vela sequentia malos.

So the MSS.: *malis* Ehwald. Read: *malo*. Paris's ship had only one mast: cf. V. 53.

XVI. 320:

Tunc ego iurabo quaevis tibi numina meque

Adstringam verbis in sacra iura tuis.

So P: for *iura* I restore *vestra* 'the rites of your nation or family': *iura* and *vestra* are very like when *vestra* is written contractly.

XVII. 73:

Plus multo est quod amas quod sum tibi causa laboris.

la in *laboris* in P is ma. 2 and V and other MSS. have *doloris*. Read: *caloris*.

XVII. 114:

Sed sine, quam tribuit sortem fortuna, tueri:
Nec spoliū nostrī turpe pudoris *habe*.
habe is awkward. The true reading is
doubtless *ave*: written *hauē*, hence *habe*:
'don't covet the spoil of my shame.'

XVIII. 121:

Hoc quoque si *credis*, ad te via prona videtur,
A te cum redeo clivus inertis aquae.
credis P, *credas* G; read *credes*.

XVIII. 203:

Desino; parce queri. sed *ut et* mare finiat
iram,
Accedant, quaeso, fac tua vota meis.
ut et, as it seems, P: *ut hanc* V, *ut hoc* (?)
G. Read: *uti*: the loss of *i* caused the
variants.

XIX. 62:

Nunc dare quae soleo madidis velamina
membris,

Pectora nunc iuncto nostra fovere sinu.
So P.: Merkel reads *nostro iuncta* and he is
followed by Ehwald. But an epithet seems
to lurk in *nostra* of P: the 'frozen bosom'
of her Leander is what Hero thinks of
warming: perhaps

Pectora nunc iuncto *tosta* fovere sinu—
scil. *frigore tosta*.

XX. 48.

Si non proficient artes veniemus ad arma
Inque tui cupidus rapta ferere sinus.
So Sedlmayer. P₁ has *tui cupidus—sinu*,
P₂ has *meo cupido—sinu*. I write
Vique tui cupido rapta ferere sinu.
In is not wanted, cf. *Art.* 1. 128, and *vi* adds
strength.

XX. 76.

Ante tuos liceat flentem consistere vultus,
Et liceat lacrimis addere verba suis.

For *meis* P has *sui*, G *suis*, some inferior
MSS. *tuis*. Read *sua*. Cf. XIV. 67:

'Haec ego: dumque queror lacrimae *sua*
verba sequuntur.'

Rem. Am. 207-210:

Lenius est studium, studium tamen, *alite*
capta,

Aut lino aut calamis praemia parva sequi:
Vel quae piscis edax avido male devoret ore
Abdere *supremis* aera recurva cibis.

Ovid has been advising the lover to hunt—to hunt the hare, the deer, the boar—in verses 200-204. He here advises the quest of even small game: in the first couplet he prescribes fowling: in the latter angling. For *calamo* I take to mean the fowler's lined rod, *lino* snares of thread: fishing does not begin until verse 209. Now *alite capta* is very awkward, in fact untranslatable in the context: I wish to read *amite capta*. I am aware that it is generally supposed that the *a* of *ames* is short: and Hor. *Epod.* II. 33 'aut amite levi rara tendit retia' is supposed to prove that quantity. But Maguire (*Hermathena*, vol. V. p. 333) proposes to scan there *amite lēvi*. The division of the tribrach would be allowable in Plautus and Terence: and it is not inconceivable in Horace. *Amentum*, supposed to be for *apmentum*, has its first syllable long. How comes it that *ames*, supposed to be for *apmes*, has its first syllable short? Read *amite* here and all is smooth: you have three recognised methods of fowling: *ames*, the pole for spreading nets: *lino* the snare: *calamus* the lined rod.

For *supremis* in 210, it seems to me that the simplest correction is *suspensis*: bait hung on the hook, and dangled before the fish.

ARTHUR PALMER.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF *OSTERIA* AND SIMILAR WORDS.

I HAVE happened so frequently during the last few months upon what seems to me a false etymology for a rather large class of words, and have found this false etymology in such excellent authorities, that a statement of the real derivation of these words may not be out of place. The list of words in question includes *oste* It. (*landlord*), *hoste* old Fr., *hospede* Port., *gast* Ger., etc.

Now Cicero *de Off.* I. 12, 37 says: *hostis* apud maiores nostros is dicebatur, quem nunc

peregrinum dicimus. This statement of Cicero in regard to the early meaning of *hostis* is confirmed by the use of the word in Plaut. *Trin.* 102 *Hostisne an civis comedis, parvi pendere*, and in Varro *L.L.* v. 3 *hostis, nam tum eo verbo dicebant peregrinum*. Expressions in Plautus *Mil.* 450, *Curc.* 5 and in Horace *Epist.* I. 15, 29, suggest the same meaning for *hostis*, viz. *stranger*.

The similarity in the meaning and external form has given rise to the almost un-

questioned belief that the class of words mentioned above is derived from *hostis*, and preserves the original meaning of that word. This belief is for example definitely stated by Brix, Plaut. *Trin.* 102, who, after bringing together proofs of this early meaning of *hostis*, adds: 'Die älteste Bedeutung tritt in den abgeleiteten Wörtern der Tochtersprachen (*osteria* u.a.) noch hervor.' In support of his position Brix cites Corssen *Kritische Beiträge* S. 217 ff. This idea that the archaic and therefore colloquial meaning of *hostis* comes to the surface again in the Romance languages in such words as the Italian *oste* and *osteria*, and that this fact is a proof that the elements of the Romance languages are to be found in colloquial rather than in literary Latin, is also suggested by Wagner in his edition of the *Trinummus*: *hostis* is etymologically the same as the German *Gast* (English *guest*). Practically the same statement is to be found also in other English editions of the *Trinummus*, e.g. in that of Freeman and Sloman. The same position is taken by Rebling (*Versuch einer Charakteristik römischen Umgangssprache*, Kiel 1883) on p. 17: 'Winkelmänn, macht darauf aufmerksam, dass die ursprüngliche älteste Bedeutung des lat. *hostis* in den daraus entstandenen Wörtern in den Töchtersprachen (*osteria* etc.) allein hervortritt,' and finally in a review of Rebling's book in Wölfflin's *Archiv.* I. 133, the reviewer remarks upon this very word, as though it were the most striking instance of the point under consideration: 'Wie unerwartet aber oft ältestes Latein und Romanisch zusammenfallen, zeigt das bekannte Beispiel *hostis*, der Fremde (im Sinne von *hospes*) und ital. *osteria*, Wirtshaus.'

Notwithstanding the weight of these authorities the writer believes that the above etymology is fanciful and incorrect, and that if the theory of which it is given as an illustration had no better evidence to support it, it would fall to the ground. Italian has two words *oste* of the same form but distinct in their meaning and immediate origin. The one *oste* means *army* and is the lineal descendant of the classical *hostis* (*enemy*). The other *oste* means *host* and is borrowed from the old French *oste* (compare G. Gröber, *Vulgarlateinische Substrata romanischer Wörter* in *Archiv. f. lat. Lex.* III. p. 141), which in turn is derived from *hospes*.

The two stems *hospit-* (with the meaning *guest* or *host*) and *hosti-* (with the meaning *enemy* and with this meaning only) appear

side by side in most of the Romance languages: e.g. the former in *huesped* Span., *hospede* Port., *ospetu* Roum., *ospite* Sard., etc.; the latter in *hueste* Span., *hoste* Port., *oste* Roum. etc.

The changes which *hospes* underwent are perhaps not difficult to follow.

The oblique cases of *hospes*, e.g. *hospitem*, have an unaccented penultimate vowel. That there was a tendency to syncopate such a vowel is evident from Quint. I. 6 Sed Augustus quoque in epistolis ad C. Caesarem scriptis emendat, quod is 'calidum' dicere quam 'caldum' malit, non quia id non sit Latinum, sed quia sit otiosum. Forms with the short penultimate vowel syncopated are frequently met with in Latin literature especially where the language is of the more colloquial sort, e.g. *saeclum* Plaut. *Mil.* 1079 etc., *tableis* Corp. Inscr. I. 200. 46, *Caldus* Cato *R.R.* 6. 1. etc., *oraculum* Varr. *Sat. Men.* 459 etc.

This tendency became a law in French which has been stated as follows: when the penultimate of a Latin word is without accent, the Latin vowel disappears in French (compare *oraculum* with *oracle*, *tabula* with *table*, *positus* with *poste*). In accordance with this law *hospitem* becomes *hosp'tem*, imagining the latter form for convenience sake as a possible stopping-point in the degradation of the word. *Hosp'tem* loses *p* in accordance with the principal enunciation by Körting (*Encyclopaedie der romanischen Philologie*), I. p. 96: 'Schwierige Combinationen entstanden durch den Ausfall tonloser, einzelne Consonanten trennender Vocale (z.B. *anima* aus *an[i]ma*, *camra* aus *cam[e]ra* etc.). Die romanische Lautentwicklung hat nun dahin gestrebt, sich dieser schwierigen Combinationen thunlichst zu entledigen etc. Die zur Tilgung schwerer Consonantencombinationen angewendeten Mittel sind namentlich: ' [Then follow various illustrations and finally] d) Wegfall des einen der beiden (bzw. der drei) Consonanten, z. B. des *n* in *nm*: des *g* in *gn*: des *p* in *pt* etc.

Compare the loss of *p* in *acheter* (Lat. *adaptare*). *Hosp'tem* in accordance with this principle drops into *hostem*, and by the regular weakening of the ending into *hoste*, which in turn is borrowed by Italian in the form *oste*, out of which by the addition of the ending *eria* comes *osteria*.

F. F. ABBOTT,
Yale University.

DR. DÖRPFELD'S THEORY OF THE GREEK STAGE.

BEFORE we accept Dr. Dörpfeld's theory (see *Classical Review* for June 1890) that the actors in a Greek theatre performed in the orchestra and not on the stage, some explanation ought to be forthcoming of certain passages in the *Poetics* of Aristotle, in which the contrary seems to be implied. Aristotle several times uses ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς in a way very hard to reconcile with the new theory:

1. 13. 6. ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν σκηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγώνων τραγικώταται αἱ τοιαῦται (τραγωδαίαι οὐ συστάσεις) φαίνονται.

2. 16. 1. ὁ γὰρ Ἀμφιάραος ἐξ ἱεροῦ ἀνῆει, ὃ μὴ ὄρωντα <ἀν> τὸν θεατὴν ἐλάνθανεν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐξέπεσε δυσχερανάντων τοῦτο τῶν θεατῶν.

3. 24. 4. ἔχει δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἐπεκτείνεσθαι τὸ μέγεθος πολὺ τι ἢ ἐποποιία ἴδιον διὰ τὸ ἐν μὲν τῇ τραγωδίᾳ μὴ ἐνδέχεσθαι ἅμα πραττόμενα πολλὰ μέρη μιμῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν μέρος μόνον.

4. 24. 8. τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἑκτορος δῶξιν ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ὄντα γελοῖα ἂν φαίνεται.

To these passages may fairly be added the words of Demosthenes *de Corona* §180 τούτων τινὰ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς, Κρεσφόντην ἢ Κρέοντα κ.τ.λ.

There remain two passages to be added from ch. 12 of the *Poetics* which, even if un-Aristotelian, are still of value.

5. 12. 1. ἴδια δὲ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ κόμμοι, where the meaning of τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς (lyrical utterances of actors) is not doubtful, though the definition is missing.

6. 12. 2. κόμμος δὲ θρῆνος κοινὸς χοροῦ καὶ ἀπὸ σκηνῆς, where the words are perhaps not quite right but the meaning is plain.

These passages (to which others of a similar kind could be added from later writers) appear to be decisive, unless any one will maintain that σκηνή came to be applied to the orchestra or some part of it. But is there any evidence for that? And further, does not the word ἐπὶ imply something raised above the level?

H. RICHARDS.

VERRALL'S ION OF EURIPIDES.

The Ion of Euripides with a Translation into English Verse and an Introduction and Notes, by A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Cambridge University Press, 1890.) 7s. 6d.

DR. VERRALL states in his Preface that 'the chief interest of this volume will be found in the Introduction and Translation': but he subjoins a list of 'places in which any noticeable interpretations have been proposed' and of his own emendations and suggestions in the text. And it is with these, as lying outside the sphere of 'taste,' that a review can most serviceably deal. The first departure from ordinary interpretation is on vv. 103—5, where στέφειν θ' ἱεοῖς is taken together with πτόρθοισι δάφνης 'as describing the brush, which is made of branches of bay and flocks of wool, tied together with a sacred tie of wool resembling the fillets (στέφη, στέμματα) used in ritual.' The usually recognized reference 'to the putting of wreaths on the temple,' it is said, 'does not seem probable' because 'in the

following scene, the tasks here mentioned are exactly followed and in the same order, the sweeping (vv. 112—141), the sprinkling (vv. 142—152) and the scaring of the birds (vv. 153—183)'; and the correspondence of the two passages would therefore be disturbed by mention of wreaths in the earlier one. This is a characteristic instance of the wonderful minuteness and ingenuity in all Dr. Verrall's work. The suggested interpretation can hardly be called convincing without an instance of the use of στέφη in the sense here required: and as to the want of symmetry, one may incline to say with the Homeric critic who noted a striking Euripidean discrepancy in vv. 26 and 812 of the *Phoenissae*, τὰ τοιαῦτα κυρίως οὐ λέγεται, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἐπιφορὰν ἐστὶ ποιητικῆς ἀρεσκείας. But the natural opposition roused by the novelty of the rendering is useful in its way. A similar ingenuity is present in the rendering (after Heath, apparently) of ἀφίκον εἰς μέμναν (v. 404) as 'you met my anxiety,' on the analogy of ἐλθεῖν εἰς χρεῖαν or εἰς καιρόν. Leaving aside the question of analogy, this translation would seem to require the perfect rather than the aorist.

But, again, it makes the the reader question his own traditional notions. To pass over some less striking suggestions, including that on vv. 602—6 (where 'a play' is recognized 'not only on the senses of ψῆφος, but also on πόλεις ἔχειν, hold the forts and fill administrations'—'the point of this passage' turning 'on a comparison between politics as a game between the "ins" and "outs" and the game of draughts'), the new senses given to αἰλῖος (v. 499) as a 'diminutive of αἰλός' and σκήψιν (v. 721) as 'descent from σκήπτειν descend, applied to such things as a missile' recall the editor's dealings with τὸ πᾶν (τοπᾶν) in Pindar. Perhaps a still closer resemblance to that procedure is found in the change of καλῶς into κάλως in v. 1410 ['stop twisting the rope and I will take it']: 'the image' being 'taken from two persons employed at rope-making, one *twisting* and the other *taking* off the walk the successive lengths as they are finished.' Of adherence to the MSS. under generally admitted difficulties vv. 755 and 828 are good instances: the defence in each case is supported by quotation or analogy, with a cleverness that might, one feels, uphold the corruptest text. Conservative, again, is the refusal to acknowledge γενέας (v. 916) as meaning 'son' and τροφεία (v. 1493) in the sense of 'nourishment.' Dr. Verrall indeed limits his refusal in the first passage: but in the second says, 'There is no proof that τροφεία could mean τροφαί feeding.' How does this conservatism (of a radical) explain *Oed. Col.*, 341? There are three interpretations, finally, in which the editor's peculiar conception of the plot causes him to differ from received modes: in vv. 1242—3, 1355 and 1562. The first—

οὐκ ἔστι λαθεῖν ὅτε μὴ χρεῖζων
θεὸς ἐκκλέπτει—

is spoken by the Chorus in imminent fear of death and despair of escape. Dr. Verrall's translation is

'Nay, escape is only given
To secrets by the will of Heaven.'

The second is spoken by the Pythia to Ion as she gives him the cradle and σπάργαλα:

λαβὼν νυν αὐτὰ τὴν τεκοῦσαν ἐκπῶναι.

Dr. Verrall regards this as possibly meaning 'take them by compulsion from τὴν τεκοῦσαν' as well as *take them* and 'win thy mother by labour.' His metrical version tries 'to preserve the ambiguity' and runs:—

'Take it...from her who bore thee...wrest
herewith
Her secret.'

The last is in Athena's speech: Apollo is said to have given Ion

οἷς ἔδωκεν οὐ φύσασί σε
ἀλλ' ὡς νομίζῃ 'ς οἶκον εὐγενέστατον.

νομίζῃ 's is a correction of the MS. νομίζεις or νομίζης. Dr. Verrall's note runs: 'νομιζομενοι νιέεις was the common Attic phrase for *son by law* :.....on the model of this the poet coins a peculiar phrase to describe (not without irony) the highly peculiar proceeding of Apollo who "recognised his son" or "admitted him by recognition" not into his own house but another's.'

These three interpretations obviously belong to one who is θέσιν διαφυλάττων: a main point in which is that Ion shall be hinted at throughout the play as the son of Xuthus and the Pythia. The thesis is worked out in the Introduction in a way that suggests purposed order in the editor's description of himself on the title-page: 'Barrister-at-law, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge.' It is an extraordinary *jeu d'esprit*, taking the form of an epilogue to the play, Gilbertian in its topsyturvydom—its author even gives us a Gilbertian refrain in his introductory paraphrase of Athena's speech (Intro. p. xviii.)—and its ἥθος. As a literary performance it may rank, for sheer ability, with the Translation, and might well be commended to the next Greek-Play-Acting Committee for representation: for it would certainly give the audience a very fair notion of how things Greek appear to a most accomplished and subtle expositor. Yet—ἄλλως μὲν τὰ τοιαῦτα χαρίεντα, λίαν δὲ δεινὰ.

ALFRED GOODWIN.

SHUCKBURGH'S FIFTH BOOK OF HERODOTUS.

Herodotus V. Terpsichore, by E. S. SHUCKBURGH M.A. Cambridge University Press. 1890. 3s.

In this edition of the fifth book of Herodotus Mr. Shuckburgh has given us another of his very useful volumes. The book supplies the reader with a great deal of the information required to enable him to understand both the text and the history. We have a historical introduction, notes on the text, a text with analysis, explanatory notes, a historical and geographical index or dictionary, and an index to the notes. There is also a map but, like most of the maps issued in English books, it is a very indifferent affair.

In the notes there are some oversights which will need consideration in a second edition.

Chap. 2.—*νῦν ἡμέτερον τὸ ἔργον* is printed both in text and 'lemma,' but the note is on *ἔργον* without *τὸ*, which is quite a distinct reading.

Chap. 8.—In a difficult passage *κατὰ λόγον μονομαχίης* are taken together and translated 'in the way of single combat.' In illustration two instances of *ἐν λόγῳ* are quoted, which is quite a different thing. *Κατὰ λόγον* means 'in proportion:' cf. i. 134 *κατὰ λόγον τῆς ἀρετῆς*. The meaning of the passage seems to be; 'prizes are given in proportion (to the nature of the contest) and the largest for single combat.'

Chap. 11.—*ἐτράποντο κατὰ* is translated 'turned their attention to:' and so in chap. 15. It is rather 'went away to.'

Chap. 25.—We are told that Western Asia was divided into two satrapies, with a reference to iii. 90. It is there divided into three, and the difficulty is to understand the relation of the original three to the later two satrapies.

Chap. 28.—The words *οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον* need cause no trouble, even if we take Grote's date for the Scythian expedition. For Herodotus uses the words (with the addition of *τινά*) of the reign of Cleomenes, which lasted about thirty years (chap. 48).

Chap. 35.—*Μεγαβάτη διαβεβλημένος* (see chap. 97) does not mean, 'because he had been rendered an object of suspicion to Megabates,' but because 'he was at variance with M.' There had been an open quarrel.

Chap. 38.—*ἔδεε—συμμαχίης—ἐξευρεθῆναι*, 'it was necessary for him to find up (†) some

strong body of allies.' The expression of Herodotus implies a confusion of the construction of *δεῖ* with the accusative, in which the infinitive cannot be omitted, with the construction with the genitive, in which it is not required. This should have been noticed.

Chap. 41.—There should have been a note on the curious phrase *τὸ δεύτερον ἐπελθούσα*, in which *τὸ δεύτερον* is used as = *ἐς ἴσπερον*.

Chap. 59.—*οὐδέ οἱ ἐξεγένετο*, 'nor had he the opportunity.' Rather: 'nor did he succeed,' as in the well-known passage, iii. 142, *τῷ δικαιοτάτῳ ἀνδρῶν βουλομένῳ γεινέσθαι οὐκ ἐξεγένετο*.

Chap. 56.—'The Great Panathenaea, because on the day of that feast alone was it possible for a citizen to enter Athens with arms without rousing suspicion.' For this Thucydides vi. 56 is quoted; but Thucydides merely says that it was the only day on which those who conducted the procession could assemble in arms.

Chap. 58.—'The earliest settlements of the Phoenicians were on the island of Thera.' What is meant by this?

ibid. 'In speaking of the Ionians as being nearest to them Herodotus seems to refer to the early settlements of Phoenicians in Kypros and Rhodes.' But Herodotus is speaking of the Phoenicians in Boeotia.

Chap. 62.—'75 talents' should be 300 talents (see ii. 180).

Chap. 89.—*ἀπὸ ἀδικίον*, 'from doing trespass on the Aeginetans.' But the text is *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδικίον*, and this seems decisive for translating 'after the outrage of the Aeginetans.' Nor is it easy to see how the act of the Athenians, who wished to punish an unprovoked attack, can be called *ἀδικίον*.

Chap. 95. and chap. 113.—In both of these chapters serious chronological difficulties occur, about which something might be said. How could Periander settle a quarrel which must have been going on long after 560 B.C. ? or is it credible that Aristocyprus in 498 was the son of the Philocyprus who entertained Solon *circ.* 580 B.C. ?

Chap. 102.—*ἐν δὲ αὐτῇσι* 'and among them:' surely it means: 'in it,' *i.e.* in Sardis.

In chapter 46 the date of the battle of Alalia is put at 557 B.C. But it must have occurred five years after the fall of Croesus. The whole note is confused. The Phoenicians *may* be the Carthaginians, but there is no

certainty that they were, and it is very probable that they were the Phoenicians who had been settled in Sicily before the Greeks arrived there. In chap. 68 Dyman-

teis and Aegineios are misprints for Dymānes or Dymanātae, as Herodotus calls them, and Aegimios.

EVELYN ABBOTT.

TYRRELL AND PURSER'S LETTERS OF CICERO.

The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero, with a Revision of the Text, a Commentary, and Introductory Essays, by R. Y. TYRRELL, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek, Trinity College, Dublin, and L. C. PURSER, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. Vol. III. Dublin: University Press Series. 1890. 12s.

It is happily unnecessary at the present time to commend this edition to the attention of scholars. In the opinion of all competent judges the great promise of the first volume of this important work, of which I spoke in the Preface to my *Life and Letters of Cicero*, in 1880, has been fully sustained in the two that have succeeded, and it has distinctly taken its place in the front rank of English editions of the classics, as one showing not only great industry and scholarship, but also singular freshness and virility. There is no need now to do more than to inquire what special contribution this third volume makes to the progress of the work.

It will be seen that in accordance with the announcement made in the Preface to the second volume, 1886, Mr. Purser, who had largely assisted Prof. Tyrrell before, especially in the tedious work of the collation of MSS., is now associated with him as joint editor. What exact share each may have taken, one cannot of course tell; but I venture to think that, whatever the cause, the result, as a whole, is, without any loss of vigour, a distinct gain in soundness. The fault of the first volume certainly was too great readiness to admit clever conjectures into the text without adequate discussion or sufficient foundation. In the present volume the mere conjectures actually admitted into the text are comparatively few and are not mostly of a very startling character. By far the most brilliant of these is not due to the editors, who nevertheless may claim some credit for being the first to adopt it in the text, namely Dindorf's ἀκρα Γυρέων *pura* for the 'ἀκραιῖον *iura*' of the Medicean MS. in *Att.* v. 12, given in all edd. as ἀκραιῖον *oipa*, which is supposed

to mean 'signs of fair weather from the mastheads.' 'The reading in the text,' say the editors, 'was admirably restored by L. Dindorf from a fragment of Archilochus (54, Bergk):

ἀμφὶ δ' ἀκρα Γυρέων ὄρθον ἴσταιται νέφος,

quoted by Plutarch, *de Superst.* c. 8, and by Theophrastus, *de Sign. Temp.* 3, 8. So the heights on the promontory of Gyrae (the southern point of Tenos, due north of Paros) afforded a recognized, almost proverbial, weather-gauge, and nothing is more natural than that Cicero, who knew the words of Archilochus well, and who was now close to Paros, the birthplace of the poet, should refer to this passage, finding himself in the neighbourhood of the very place. Cicero says, here "I don't mean to stir from Delos till I see *all the peaks of Gyrae* clear." This brilliant emendation perhaps comes as near to carrying positive conviction as any conjecture can do, and we may anticipate that henceforward it will form part of the *textus receptus*.

In *Att.* v. 21 the editors adopt the reading of Gronovius, *caculae*, 'a soldier's servant,' for the MS. reading *canule*, which is generally taken to represent a proper name, Canuleius. In *Att.* vii. 1 they give a very probable explanation of the curious sentence, 'ubi illae sunt densae dexteræ?' by printing it as a verse from an iambic poet, with the first syllable of *illae* short according to the archaic usage. The strange epithet *densae*, for which *tensae* has been commonly conjectured, is then probably a rendering or reminiscence of a Greek original πικναί. In *Att.* vii. 3 they retain, with Lachmann, the archaic *noenu*, for the MS. '*noen*' which has been too hastily changed into *non* by editors. It is clear that such an archaism was much more likely in Cicero himself than in any of his copyists. So also they print *quoius* in a letter of Caelius, *Fam.* viii. 1, for *cuius*, introduced against the MSS. In *Att.* vii. 2 they alter *prudentius* of the MSS. into *spurce*, as an essential antithesis to *spurce*.

Many similar conjectures are only suggested in the notes, some of them as good probably as most of those admitted into the text. Such are the insertion of *de* before *DCCC aperuisti* in *Att. v. 1*; *ride modo* for *vide modo* in a letter of Caelius, *Fam. viii. 2*, after Wesenberg; *νομαίαν ἀργίας* *excusationem*, in *Att. v. 11*, for the corrupt *νομαρπια* *excusationem*, i.e. 'the banal excuse of idleness.' Perhaps better than any of these is the explanation suggested of (*Julia lege*) *transita* in *Att. v. 21*, as an inter-linear gloss, *in transitu*, of the original *ἐν παρόδῳ*, 'during my official progress.' On the other hand the editors would do well to recollect occasionally that different conjectures thrown out, as it were, at random only weaken one another, and that when they hesitate between *puta te me* or *πατηρὸν* for *putato* (*Att. vii. 7*), and offer for *iam Romae* (*Att. v. 19*), an 'embarras derichesse' of *quadrimam, tanta πόμῃ, iam σπογγῇ, iam ὀρηγῇ, iam amore*, and even *moratam*, none of these wild guesses are likely to be very seriously considered.

The letters included in the present volume, 118 in all, are those of the two years 51 and 50 B.C. only, during nearly the whole of which time Cicero was absent on his 'Lord-Lieutenancy' of Cilicia. They are of far less dramatic interest than the preceding set of the Exile, or the succeeding one of the Civil War, but are nevertheless of considerable importance, both as throwing light on the worn-out senatorial system of provincial misgovernment to which the revelation of the character of that most detestable of all Romans, Brutus, startlingly contributes, and also, chiefly owing to the cynically candid letters of Caelius, as helping us to thread our way through the intricate tangle of preliminary feints which preceded the actual outbreak of the War. In place of an excursus on the Provincial Government of Cicero, Prof. Tyrrell reprints an essay contributed by him to the *Quarterly Review* for October, 1888. It was noted at the time as a very able essay, but it perhaps needs a certain amount of re-writing to adapt it to its present position. There is also a life of that remarkably interesting character, Marcus Caelius Rufus, based in large measure upon the charmingly written paper on him in M. Boissier's '*Cicéron et ses amis*,' and a discussion of his peculiar style, abounding at once in archaisms and in popular slang, where the editors acknowledge their obligations to a pamphlet

on the subject by Dr. Ferdinand Becher of Ilfeld. They adopt without hesitation—indeed without the least mention of a disputed opinion—the theory that Catullus' Lesbia was Clodia, and 'have no doubt' that the Rufus of the 77th ode of Catullus, who had been 'trusted fruitlessly and in vain,' was Marcus Caelius, the very man who, according to Quintilian, gave her the terrible nickname of 'Quadrantaria.' A practised translator cannot but sympathise with Prof. Tyrrell in his task of rendering this name, but he must be painfully conscious that 'a two-penny-halfpenny Clytaemnestra' (p. xlv.) is not only rather feeble in itself, but entirely omits the whole point of the name, which he has rightly explained on the page before by a reference to the '*scortum diobolare*' of Plautus.

This is however a very rare if not unique specimen, at any rate of feebleness in translation. Like all scholars who have emancipated themselves from the wooden stage of translation in which the probable meaning is both the Alpha and the Omega, Prof. Tyrrell most carefully emphasizes the curious and often inaccurate Greek phrases which form such a marked feature of the Letters to Atticus, not, as is sometimes carelessly stated, of Cicero's letters altogether; and his success in the great majority of cases is such as to make one wish that none had been left unattempted. Mostly of course they are rendered by colloquial French, as *σπατήρημα*, a 'ruse'; *πρόσνευσιν*, a 'penchant'; *ἐν ἐπιτροπῇ*, 'tout court'; and so forth; but the Greek of medical terms is rightly distinguished as technical, for which the Latin of chemists gives us probably the nearest correspondence, while certain others Prof. Tyrrell rather audaciously still renders by slang, such as *δυσδιάγνωστον*, 'not a pin to choose'; *πεινητικήν*, 'doing Banting' (surely this at least is too ephemeral); *haec λαμπρά*, 'this is a score for me.'

All scholars will see with pleasure in the Preface that Prof. Tyrrell and Mr. Purser 'hope to finish the whole work in two more volumes in the course of the next three or four years.' The next volume, which will contain the letters of the Civil War, will probably be the most important and interesting of the whole series, and there is no fear that it will fail at least to rise to the very high level which, when all minor criticisms have been made, this important work has undoubtedly claimed and maintained.

G. E. JEANS.

PALAIPHATOS, A RATIONALIST OF THE FOURTH CENTURY B.C.

Intorno all' opuscolo di PALEFATO DE INCREDIBILIBUS. Considerazioni di Niccola Festa. Firenze—Roma: 1890.

THIS tract should be read by any who are studying the tendencies of Greek thought in the fourth century B.C. The object of the author is to establish the existence of a new literary figure, a rationalist who was on the road to Euëmeros but did not get so far. The first who pointed out that way seems to have been the historian Hekataios: certainly the bold words with which he introduced his *Genealogies*—τάδε γράφω ὡς μοι ἀληθία δοκεῖ εἶναι: οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοὶ τε καὶ γελοιοί, ὡς ἐμοὶ φαίνονται, εἰσὶν—have nothing to match them in Herodotus; and instances of the manner in which he criticised myths are not wanting even in the few fragments and notices of his works that are preserved to us. But the idea of dealing methodically with legendary miracles was reserved (if Signor's Festa's views are right) for a pupil of Aristotle, and the notion started at Miletus was developed into a system at Athens.

We are familiar with the name Palaiphatos, as the author of a treatise *περὶ τῶν ἀπίστων*. But who was Palaiphatos? Looking into Suidas (and that means into Hesychios), we are more puzzled than ever. We find a number of Palaiphatoi, born or dwelling in different places and authors of various works. Our Italian scholar, following in the tracks of Gutschmid, tries to solve the puzzle by rolling all these people into one, and he juggles his data ingeniously. One wonders whether this method of synthesis is safer than the method of analysis which is more often adopted. Is it more likely to happen that two distinct persons should get rolled into one, or that one person should get split up into two? If it is an unsound principle to solve chronological difficulties about Pheidon of Argos by assuming two Pheidons, is it also dubious to introduce order into the notices of Suidas and various scholiasts by building one Palaiphatos out of four?

The very name Palaiphatos raises a question. Did some one really call his son Palaiphatos, or have we to do with a writer who as far as his name is concerned should be ranked with Stésichoros and possibly Hesiod? Certainly, if the writer *περὶ τῶν ἀπίστων* was Palaiphatos from his birth, he claved in his works to a name which suggested the Homeric *παλαίφατα θέσφατα*

(p. 32). However this may be, the new Palaiphatos, whom Gutschmid and Festa have raised up into life, was born (according to his restorers) at Parion on the Hellespont in the days of Artaxerxes iii. (Ochos) and was a pupil and favourite (*παιδικά*) of Aristotle at Athens. Theon of Alexandria speaks of Palaiphatos, the Peripatetic (*Rhet. Graec.* i. 221 Walz). The work of the pupil from Parion was to apply systematically a method of interpretation, which we find applied in a special instance by the pupil from Messene. Dicaearchus put into a rational form the legend of the Golden Age (*F.G.H.* ii. p. 233, Porphyrius, *de Abst.* iv. 2). This Palaiphatos collected the mythical stories prevalent in various countries, and called his writings after those places—*Τρωικά*, *Ἀττικά*, *Κυπριακά*, etc. The treatise which has come down to us, containing the interpretations of nearly fifty tales, is merely (as Festa has tried to show) a selection from these works, and not, in its present form, due to Palaiphatos himself. In this particular point, I think, Festa has made out his case. Whether the author of the *Τρωικά* was also the author of the *ἀπίστων βιβλία* ε', I profess not to know; but I agree with the conclusion that the *de Incredibilibus* is not an original work, but put together from excerpts of a bigger book or a series of books.

Whatever we may think of the identification of Palaiphatos the historian with Palaiphatos the antimythographer, and of both with the grammarian; whatever we may think of the way in which the five places where a Palaiphatos was or may have been born—(1, 2) Πάριος ἢ Πιργηνεύς, in some MSS *Παριηνεύς*, (3) Ἀβυδηνός, (4, 5) Ἀιγύπτιος ἢ Ἀθηναῖος—are reduced to Parion and Athens, as an old and a new home; we must certainly own that the general view which Festa advocates is supported by a line of the comic poet Athenion in a passage quoted by Athenaeus:

καὶνὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν οὗτος Πалаίφατος,

where there is a play on the name. The context shows clearly enough that a reference is intended to a writer who collected all sorts of fanciful and strange matters for the purpose of rendering probable what at first sight seems incredible. The date of Athenion cannot be fixed. Festa, not having learned the new lesson at Berlin, calls him a writer

of
li
av
m
fr
wh
th
to

Pa
ha
kn
esa
ph
der
aw
Eu
ord
be
and

Sop
h
zw
18
A u
ting
print
short
action
first
chori
whic
of th
Laur
name
the c
lished
1887
τοσο
the v
del τ
third
ment
that
stage
This
no exp

Der
ros
USE

THIS
Lau
died
Petra
same
about
author
two w
century
the 35
Gymna

of 'Middle' Comedy. That a Palaiphatos lived in the fourth century and explained away the miraculous element in the popular myths we can infer, without any juggling, from the *first* notice in Suidas; and such a writer would certainly have been a butt for the comedians of his day. Festa does well to insist on the phrase of Athenion.

Another argument for this date is that a Palaiphatos subsequent to Euëmeros is hardly conceivable. Euëmeros, of whom we know so little, is 'un ampliatore ed un esageratore dell' idea di Palefato.' Palaiphatos never disbelieved in the gods or denied their powers; he only explained away supposed miracles in particular cases. Euëmeros reduced the gods and goddesses to ordinary men and women. Ephoros might be said to represent a stage between the milder and the more thoroughgoing rationalist;

and Festa supposes that the rationalistic tendency apparent in some of the fragments of that historian was due to the new system of Palaiphatos.

I need not go into the origin of the mythical seer Palaiphatos of whom we read in the *Ecphrasis* of Christodoros, who saw a statue, under that name, in the Baths of Zeuxippos at Constantinople. But before concluding, I may notice one point in Suidas which neither Festa nor the Germans (Gutschmid and Eckstein) have accounted for. It surely strikes one as odd that a 'King' should be chosen to give the date of the author of the ἀρίστον βιβλία. What had Palaiphatos, whoever he was, to do with Persia? If Parion was really his birthplace, is the hidden link there?

J. B. BURY.

Sophokles' Aias, für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von FRIEDRICH SCHUBERT: zweite, verbesserte Auflage. Leipzig: G. Freytag. 1891.

A USEFUL school edition of the tragedy, by a distinguished Sophoclean scholar, containing a well printed, carefully constituted text, preceded by a short statement of the subject and an analysis of the action, and followed by three supplements. The first supplement contains a careful analysis of the choric metres, the somewhat complicated notation of which is thoroughly explained. The second is a list of the conjectural emendations of the reading of the Laurentian MS. (A) adopted in this edition, with the names of their authors. Among these are three of the editor's own which have previously been published in the *Ztschr. f. Oesterr. Gymn.* in the vols. for 1887 and 1888. (In v. 269, where Gleditsch's *τοσοῦτος* for the MS. *τοσοῦτες* is adopted, he reads the v. as a question: in v. 835 he reads *ἔνεπε* for *ἀεί τε*: and in v. 1311 *ληστῆς* for *τῆς σῆς*.) The third supplement is a short account of the arrangement of a Greek theatre (in which the author teaches that up to the Roman period there was no raised stage for the actors), and of the actors' costume. This is illustrated by some good pictures. There are no explanatory notes.

E. B. ENGLAND.

Der heilige Theodosios, Schriften des Theodoros und Kyrillos, herausgegeben von HERMANN USENER. Leipzig: Teubner, 1890. pp. xxiii, 210.

THIS excellently printed little volume contains the *Laudatio* of the Archimandrite S. Theodosius, who died A.D. 529, by his disciple Theodoros, Bishop of Petra c. A.D. 536, and a very brief biography of the same saint by Cyril of Scythopolis, who flourished about the middle of the sixth century and was the author of various lives of saints. The text of the two writings is taken from a MS. of the eleventh century at Florence, and was published to celebrate the 350th anniversary of the foundation of the Gymnasium of Weilburg, of which the editor was

formerly a student. The two writings in a manner form a pair, and together make a complete whole, treating of the same subject and being a valuable source of information respecting monasticism in the East. Theodosius was the head of a monastery near Jerusalem. Born in Cappadocia c. A.D. 412 he developed a taste for the life of a monk at an early age. He was for a time a disciple of Simeon Stylites, but eventually founded a monastery of his own, where he was visited by the Cappadocian Sabas, who had founded a monastery on the Kidron. Cyril of Scythopolis wrote a life of Sabas as well as of Theodosius: it has been edited by Cotelier in the *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta*.

Usener rates the historical value of Cyril's work highly, in spite of the large admixture of the miraculous which, in accordance with the taste of the age, it contains. It is specially valuable for the light which it throws upon chronology, owing to the number of clear dates which Cyril gives. In his life of S. Sabas he takes credit for the *χρόνων ἀκρίβεια* that he has attained.

The editor appears to have no doubt that the life of Theodosius is the work of Cyril, about which previous scholars have had misgivings. For a time it was known only in a Latin form. He has increased the value of his carefully edited text by adding seventy-three pages of notes.

A. PLUMMER.

Sulpicii Severi Liber de Vita Sancti Martini cum Epistulis et Dialogis. Avec notes, etc. en français, par FR. DÜBNER. Paris, in-12, 1890. Pp. i—viii, 1—116.

THIS little text-book is a new and slightly enlarged edition of one which appeared in 1859. The text has been revised, and the spelling restored, though not uniformly, to a purer type, in accordance with the edition of Karl Halm, 1866. In this respect the editor has shown more courage than Hurter, who in his preface to vol. xlviii of the *Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula*, containing Severus, praises Halm indeed, but adds: 'rationem habentes lectorum nostrorum,

veterem scribendi rationem in rebus quas vocant orthographicis non sequemur.

Besides the *Vita S. Martini* the little work before us contains, with some omissions, the three Letters acknowledged to be genuine, and also the Dialogues. The first twenty-two chapters of *Dial. i.* are left out, as having no direct reference to St. Martin, and the fact that *Dial. ii.* is really only a continuation of *i.*, and ought not to be numbered separately, is duly pointed out. The seven *Epistulae* often printed at the end of editions of Severus are properly omitted as spurious. Halm prints them, but merely for completeness' sake; mentioning that a transcript of the first was sent to him by the late H. A. J. Munro, 'scientissimus Lucretii editor.'

Dübner's notes, as might be expected from the worker on Didot's great *Thesaurus*, are scholarlike and to the point, though necessarily brief. He is careful to point out the ways in which Severus deviates from the standard of pure latinity. Why such an educational reformer as Dübner should have thought it worth while to edit a fourth century ecclesiastical writer for school use, may to some be not very intelligible. But he defends his choice of an author on the ground that, while only writers of pure Greek and Latin should be used for the early years of a scholar's training, he will read with profit at a later stage these works 'pleines de sève,' whose writers may have disdained the ordinary artifices of composition. Granted his subject, the *method* he adopts is quite in accordance with the principles he insisted on in more than one of his many pamphlets:—'former la jeunesse des écoles secondaires à savoir le plus tôt possible lire couramment les auteurs simples et faciles' (*Quelques mots sur la prochaine Réforme* etc., 1862).

But whatever benefit students of late Latin, or of ecclesiastical history, may derive from them, we doubt the wisdom of making such treatises as the *Vita S. Martini* into class-books for the French lycées. Apart from the *speciosa miracula* of that once most popular work—a subject unsuited for discussion here—the latinity of Severus does not, in our opinion, deserve the praise sometimes bestowed upon it. It contains abundance of Sallust, Cicero, and Livy, but embedded, not assimilated. The style of a young reader is not likely to be much improved by reading an author, who, as he has constantly to be warned, uses *credo quia* and the subj. for acc. and infin., *esse* and the gerund for fut. inf. pass., *quorum ambo* for *qui ambo*, *sicut* for *dum*, and such forms as *sinerunt* and *spebus*; with whom *paterfamilias* means a cook and *custodiae* prisoners; and who can write such a sentence as 'ego, inquam, non *solummodo* taceo, sed olim de istis tacere *disposui*' (p. 77).

M. Dübner has rendered a service to lexicography in striking out the word *gurdonicus* (p. 60), still found even in Lewis and Short, and explained as 'doltish,' 'rustic'; showing it to be a local appellative, denoting most probably a native of *Gurdonis Castra*, now Sancerre. He is less correct in saying (p. 8) that *ferrum* is not used in classical prose for gladius. The passage he desires (p. 58) in illustration of *Bosphorus exclusa* may perhaps be found in Tibullus iv. i. 53.

'Qua maris extremis tellus excluditur undis.'

J. H. LUPTON.

Collectio Librorum Juris Antejustiniani. T. 3.

THIS is the third and concluding volume of the valuable *Collectio* issued by Krüger, Mommsen and Studemund. The texts bear evidence of most careful preparation, for which indeed the above names are, in themselves, sufficient guarantee. It may be regretted that Studemund's latest views on some of the

fragmentary passages of Gaius rather weaken than confirm some of his previous suggestions, although this is a satisfactory indication of the care with which the MS. has been re-examined. Remarks, however, are unnecessary upon the first and second volumes, which have been for some years before the public.

In the Vatican fragments, which form a third part of the present volume, we have, so far as it goes, an interesting western precursor of Justinian's Digest and Code. The parallel passages from the latter are fully quoted in foot-notes. This text is preceded by an excellent preface, from Mommsen, containing an account of the MS. and a statement of the internal evidence by which its probable date and source have been determined.

The *Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum*, which follows, is treated in an equally thorough and useful fashion by the same editor. Although a small matter, it is satisfactory to have the above classical title, whether positively ancient or not, instead of the somewhat barbarous and misleading 'Lex Dei.' The attribution of this curious comparison, by Rudorff and others, to Saint Ambrose was so interesting and attractive that one regrets to find so high an authority as Mommsen pronouncing against it.

For the *Consultatio veteris Jurisconsulti* all apparently that could be done has been done by Krüger, in collating the various editions of *Cujas*, his original being, it would seem, irreparably lost.

In the remaining portion of the volume, the same editor (Krüger) gives us a most valuable re-construction of the Codices Gregorianus and Hermogenianus, including, first the Wisigoth epitome, second the fragments of the Codices themselves. These fragments are given by reference to the various authorities for them, which are mostly contained in this third volume of the *Collectio*. The more recently discovered and inaccessible of the authorities are set out by Krüger at the end of his *Conspectus* of the Fragments. In any fresh edition of this volume it might be a convenience to the reader to print the Codices, as restored (of course only fragmentarily) by Krüger, *in extenso* and not by reference. This would, however, necessitate considerable repetition.

A most important feature in the *Collectio* must not be omitted. It is completed by excellent Indices, which go far to double its value.

E. C. CLARK.

Latin Verse. By Rev. C. H. BOUSFIELD, M.A., Oxford. George Bell and Sons. 5s. 6d.

ONE cannot but admire the zeal which has prompted the author of these Translations to enter his protest against that depreciation of Latin Verse Composition which has set in with such severity in recent years, and is not likely to stay its course so long as subjects of study are dictated and limited, instead of being merely tested, by examinations. Mr. Bousfield's protest is a strong one: although his 'time and attention,' as he says in his Preface, 'have been engrossed for many years by the multifarious duties of a parish clergyman,' he has found time to translate nearly 100 extracts of English poetry, chiefly into Elegiacs. Still it must be said, with all due recognition of the devotion which has prompted this labour of love, that the strength of the protest consists rather in the quantity than in the quality of the Translations, which, by reason (no doubt) of his paramount duties, the author 'perfectum decies non castigavit ad unguem.'

The title-page sets forth that they are 'for the use of Classical Tutors and Students'; but the former would surely not allow the latter to use *terrigeni—rediet—solae* and *ullae* (as gen. sing. fem.)—*quam*

grege (p. 19)—*neve* (for *nee*)—*feræ* (neut. plur.)—*nullus* (for *nemo*)—*decipere*—*micuitur*—*lethis*—*vigilat* (for *custodit*)—*copellam*—*tris* for *ter*—*locum*—*quod*—*quisquam* in the sense of *quivis*—*defluit* transitive:—nor such constructions with *dum* as *dum non petis*, 'provided you not seek (p. 33)'—*expectat dum lux aderit*—(p. 37)—*nee...flabo...dum placuit* (p. 77)—*dum ferat* (p. 115). Objection also might be taken to many rare and ante- or post-classic words, such as *evanida*—*luam* (*vincla*)—*latescat*—*galbula*—*Eos*—*emodulare*—*campana*—*pyxis*—*fritinnit*—*eremam*: as well as to the shortening of the final syllable in *libido*—*imago*—*adesto*, &c. Even the student would shake his head at *grātulante*—*ēmēre*—*hospēs*—*Glifcon*—*humilem sepulchrum*—*aliqua cura*.

There are some passages of considerable obscurity: e.g. p. 1, l. 2. 'Qua tibi me dabitur parva fruenta quies'—p. 19, l. 14. 'Tum largi sumptus vixerat ulla domus,' which one is tempted to emend 'tam l. s. vix. erat u. d.'—p. 37, l. 16. 'Tunc erit utendi quod sibi tempus avet'—p. 97, l. 4. 'jacet ab hoste fugas' ('showed how fields were won.')

Attention may be called also to some misprints, not noticed in the Errata: *robotes* for *sobotes* p. 25—*meus* for *mens*, and *occulat* (?) p. 43—*cornicium* for *cornicinum* p. 45—*susurru* for *susurros* p. 49—*reccemis* for *racemis* p. 113—*consumer* (?) p. 117—*versar* for *verser* (?) p. 147—*fores* for *foros* p. 151—*sanguineis* for *sanguineus* p. 175—*vagar* for *vager* p. 197 (?)—*tremil* (?) p. 205: and on p. 163, line 5 is defective.

The translation from Cowper on p. 13 is spoiled by representing the shepherd in his contest with the nightingale as using the lyre and not the reed: and on p. 99 'Even children followed with endearing wile' is strangely rendered by 'parvulus ipse puer sequitur pede saepe doloso,' as if the intention was to pick the parson's pocket. 'Formosis viris' too is scarcely an adequate rendering of 'the fine folk of

the town.' Again, in the Epigram on p. 137, something better might have resulted from the employment of 'fax conjugii' and 'faces' than either the translation in the text, or that substituted in the Errata.

Mr. Bousfield is seen at his best in such passages as the last eight lines on p. 19 (excepting the sixth line 'non mihi dat plures, quam grege, delicias')—in the translation of T. Moore's, 'Hush, sweet lute' on p. 35—in some good rhythmical lines on p. 49—or these 'Floruit et periit procerum regumque potestas, Fors fecit variâ fors facietque vice.'

for

Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade;

A breath can make them, as a breath has made.

The translation of Gray's Sonnet on the Death of Mr. R. West is a good piece of work, and may compete with either of those printed in *Folia Silvalae*: so also are the pieces on p. 89 and 119—two of the few examples of Hexameters which the book contains. The following also may be quoted as neat:—

Hic canit irato quas verrit ab aequore praedas,
Noctis et effusis otia mixta jocis.—P. 111.

and

Quid si sacra vetet justum tibi terra sepulchrum,
Si dicat solitas noenia nulla preces?

Hic tamen, hic reliens notes ver sparget odores,
teque levi viridis pondere terra premet.—P. 175.

In short, any one who will take the trouble to read through the whole will find many agreeable examples of care and taste, though no marks of brilliant or refined scholarship: but there are too many oversights and faults.

The spelling is old-fashioned: and the practice of marking with an accent all adverbs, whether ending in *ē*, *o*, or *er*, is (to say the least of it) very unnecessary. But these are small matters.

H. KYNASTON.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE 'ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

Our next number will, we hope, contain a review of the newly discovered treatise by one who is generally recognized as the first English authority in regard to Aristotle's political writings. Meanwhile we insert a complete list of the emendations of the text which have been sent directly to the *Classical Review*, as well as of those which have appeared elsewhere up to Feb. 21. Each emendation is assigned to its author by the initials. Where two or more emendations have been sent on the same passage, they are given in the order in which they were received by the editors. Where the same emendation is made by more than three persons it is followed by Z instead of by the initials.

Mr. Kenyon has kindly compared the emendations offered with the papyrus, and added a note (signed K) where they are confirmed by the MS. reading.

We hope to have a further list of emendations in the April number.

NO. XL. VOL. V.

The emendations are by the following contributors:—

J. Burnet (JB.), I. Bywater (a) (B.), L. Campbell (LC.), C. E. Haskins (b) (CEH.), J. W. Headlam (JWH.), R. D. Hicks (b) (RDH.), A. E. Housman (H.), H. Jackson (J.), E. C. Marchant (ECM.), John E. B. Mayor (M.), Joseph B. Mayor (JBM.), A. S. Murray (ASM.), W. L. Newman (N.), W. R. Paton (c) (WRP.), A. Platt (P.), F. T. Richards (a) (FTR.), H. Richards (a) (HR.), W. Ridgeway (d) (WR.), W. G. Rutherford (R.), J. E. Sandys (e) (S.), A. Sidgwick (AS.), J. A. Smith (a) (JAS.), C. Torr (f) (CT.), W. Wyse (g) (W.).

(a) These appeared in the *Academy* for Feb. 14.

(b) In *Cambridge Reporter* for Feb. 17.

(c) In *Athenaeum* for Feb. 21.

(d) In *Academy* for Feb. 21.

(e) Partly in *Academy* for Feb. 7, partly sent direct to C. R.

(f) In *Athenaeum* for Feb. 7.

(g) Partly in *Athenaeum* for Feb. 14 and 21, partly sent direct.

c. 2 pr. p. 2 l. 4 μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα συνέβη στασιάζειν τοὺς τε γνωρίμους καὶ τὸ πλῆθος πολλὸν χρόνον * τὸν δῆμον. * τὸν δῆμον: these words are superfluous and are probably a gloss upon τὸ πλῆθος.

When Cobet removes glosses from late texts, he can appeal to *scholia*, in which even common words are explained. Readers and scribes in Egypt, say 100 A.D., needed no such helps: again, πλῆθος is not co-extensive with δῆμος, and is elsewhere found in close connexion with it. Thus c. 20 pr. p. 52: ἡττημένος δὲ ταῖς ἐταυρείαις ὁ Κλεισθένης προσηγάργετο τὸν δῆμον, ἀποδίδους τῷ πλῆθει τὴν πολιτείαν. c. 21 pr. p. 53 διὰ μὲν οὖν ταύτας τὰς αἰτίας ἐπίστανεν (so the Editor in the note for ἐπίστανεν of MS.) ὁ δῆμος τῷ Κλεισθένει· τότε δὲ τοῦ πλῆθους προεστηκώς. In c. 2 οἱ γνώριμοι and τὸ πλῆθος are the factions whose struggles convulse τὸν δῆμον. For στασιάζω is here transitive. Otherwise πολλὸν χρόνον must have been placed just before or just after στασιάζειν. In the ms. reading it separates the complex subject of the verb from the object, and keeps the reader in suspense.

c. 2 pr. p. 2 cf. c. 5 pr. p. 13 τοιαύτης δὲ τῆς τάξεως οὐσης ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ καὶ τῶν πολλῶν δουλευόντων τοῖς ὀλίγοις, ἀντίστη τοῖς γνωρίμοις ὁ δῆμος, where ὁ δῆμος does denote a party in the state. In c. 25 p. 69 l. 5 it is again found with πλῆθος: αὐξανόμενον δὲ τοῦ πλῆθους γινόμενος τοῦ δήμου προστάτης Ἐφιάλτης. cf. Aristot. pol. iv 6 p. 1293 a 3 μετέχουσι μὲν πάντες τῆς πολιτείας διὰ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τοῦ πλῆθους. Thuc. vi 39 § 1 πρῶτα μὲν δῆμον ξύμπαν ὠνομάσθαι, ὀλιγαρχίαν δὲ μέρος. **M.**

P. 2, l. 6. ἦν γὰρ... Read ἦν γὰρ τότε. **JAS.**

P. 3, l. 6. καὶ δεδεμένοι. Insert γὰρ after καί. **JBM.**

P. 3, l. 9. χαλεπώτατον μὲν οὖν καὶ πικρότατον ἦν τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν κατὰ τῆς πολιτείας [ἀρχῶν μὴ μετέχειν. I do not think that the lacuna is rightly filled up; but ἀρχῶν, if right, carries with it the correction κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν. **W.** For τῆς πολιτείας ἀρχῶν read τὴν πολιτείαν δικαίῳ. **JBM.** 'τὴν πολιτείαν is consistent with MS.' **K.**

P. 3, l. 14. Read Δράκο[ντος τοιαύδε]. **R.**

P. 5, l. 3. Insert ἡ between ἐπικατέστη πολεμαρχία so as to assimilate it to πρώτη μὲν ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως in l. 1 and τελευταία δ' ἡ τοῦ ἀρχοντος. p. 6, l. 1. **JBM.**

P. 6, l. 4. For ἀρχ[ε]ιν read ἀρ[ε]ξ[ε]ιν. The future after ὀμνύουσι. **W.**

P. 6, l. 5—10. παραχωρησάντων τῶν Κοδριδῶν... τῷ ἀρχοντι * δωρεάν. * τοῦτο μὲν

οὖν ὁποτέρως πονεῖ ἔχει μικρόν, [καὶ ἐγένετο δ' ἡ ἐν τοῖς τοῖς χρόνοις] [ση]μείον καὶ...ρίων τὸν ἀρχοντα διοικεῖν ὥσπερ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ πολέμαρχος, ἀλλὰ... Read παραχωρησάντων τῶν Κοδριδῶν τῶν προσγιγνομένων τῷ ἀρχοντι δωρεάν. τοῦτο μὲν οὖν ὁποτέρως ἔχει μικρόν διαφέρει ἐγένετο δ' ἐν τοῖς τοῖς χρόνοις. **JBM.** μικρόν διαφέρει ἄτε δὴ ἐν ἀτάκτοις τοῖς χρόνοις, and at the end ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐπιθετα. **WRP.** For καὶ...ρίων read τὸ μὴ τῶν μυστηρίων, referring to p. 143, l. 3. **JB.** The words lost between ἀλλὰ and διὰ are perhaps ὥσπερ οἱ θεομοθεταί. Some distinction seems to be drawn between the mode in which on the one hand the βασιλεὺς and the πολέμαρχος administered the δικαστήρια, and on the other the ἀρχων and the θεομοθεταί. **R.**

P. 6, l. 8. Was the last word in the lacuna πατριών? It should be noted that the archon performed none of the θυσίαί πατριοί, cp. p. 143. But I hesitate to propose a supplement before seeing the facsimile. **W.** 'πατριών is possible.' **K.**

P. 6, l. 14. The supplement αἰρ[εθέντες ἐπὶ] is unsatisfactory. Read αἰρ[ομένων] τὰς ἀρχάς. **W.**

P. 6, l. 17. [οὔτοι] μὲν οὖν [ἐς] τοσοῦτον προέχουσιν ἄλλων. ᾤκησαν δ' οὐκ ἅμα πάντες οἱ ἐννέα ἀρχοντες. 'The MS. reading here,' says the editor, 'is ἀλλήλων.' Read ἀλλήλων. ἦσαν. **J.** In connexion with this corruption it is worth while to draw attention to Diog. Laert. i. 2, 58, καὶ πρῶτος τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων ἐποίησεν εἰς τὸ συνεπεῖν, ὡς Ἀπολλόδορος φησιν ἐν δευτέρῳ περὶ τῶν νομοθετῶν. This passage fits with Suidas cited in the note οὐκ ἐξῆν αὐτοῖς ἅμα δικάζειν, and throws some doubt on Dr. Jackson's suggestion ἀλλήλων. ἦσαν. **W.**

P. 6, l. 17. The form ἐς does not seem to be used in this treatise, so that if there is only space for two letters ἐς is wrong. But the copy is evidently so carelessly made that nothing can be decided in such questions till the facsimile appears. **R.**

P. 7, last line. Cf. 129-10. If we keep κρίνεις perhaps we should read αὐτοτελῶς. **JBM.**

P. 11, l. 1. I would prefer to read ἡρῶντο δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἐννέα ἀρχοντας καὶ τοὺς ταμίαις οὐσίαν κεκτημένους οὐκ ἐλάττω δέκα μῶν ἐλευθέρων, τὰς δ' ἄλλας ἀρχὰς οὐκ ἐλάττω εἰ (for ἐλάττους) ἐκ τῶν ὅπλα παρεχομένων κ.τ.λ. **R.** Probably ἐλάττω, i.e. ἐλάττω κεκτημένων, the property of the ἄλλα ἀρχαί being lower. The στρατηγοί mentioned afterwards are exceptional. **ECM.**

P. 11, l. 3. I regard ἑκατόν as corrupt. **R.** ἐλευθέρων. Read ἐλευθέρων. **AS., W.** For

ἐλάττων' read ἔλαττων adv.: see Dobree *Advers.* on Thuc. II. 13. **ECM.**

P. 11, l. 5. τοῖτους. Read τούτου. **R.**
δεῖ[ν εἶναι] (on which we are told in the note that δει is a correction, the word originally written beginning with δι), read διαμένειν, with a reference to the following μέχρι εὐθύνων. **JBM., LC.**

P. 11, l. 5. For τούτους δέ—τοῦ γένους, we should perhaps read τούτου δέ—τοῦ τέλους. **S.**

P. 11, l. 6. τοὺς ἱπάρχους τοῦ γένους μέχρι εὐθύνων...τας δ' ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τέλους δεχομένους ὡπερ οἱ στρατηγοί. Read τοὺς ἱπάρχους ἐκάστου ἔτους μέχρι εὐθύνων, λογιστάς δ' <εἶναι> ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τέλους γενομένους ὡπερ κ.τ.λ. **JBM.** Fill up lacuna by δοκιμαστάς and read perhaps παρεχομένους for δεχομένους. **R.**

P. 11, l. 12. κληροῦσθαι δὲ καὶ ταύτην καὶ [τὰ]ς ἀλ[λα]ς ἀρχὰς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα ἔτη γεγονότας, καὶ δις τὸν αὐτὸν μὴ ἄρχειν πρὸ τοῦ πάν[τα]ς περιελθεῖν. This passage suggests an explanation of the use of the lot in elections. The rule that no one should sit for a second time until every qualified person had sat once, seems to imply that, theoretically, the lot decided, not who should hold a given office, but in what order the qualified persons should succeed to it. Thus conceived, the use of the lot is not so plainly repugnant to common sense as it is generally supposed to be. **J.**

P. 12, l. 2. πρὸ τοῦ πάν[τα]ς περιελθεῖν. With this reading I suppose πάντας must be subject, 'all came round again.' A more usual construction would be εἰς πάντας περιελθεῖν or διὰ πάντων διελθεῖν τὴν ἀρχήν. **JBM.** Perhaps πρὸ τοῦ πάν[τα]ς ἐξ[ε]λθεῖν. Cf. Xenophon, *Rep. Ath.* i. 6, μὴ εἶν λέγειν πάντας ἐξ[ε]λθεῖν καὶ βουλευεῖν. **S.**

P. 14, l. 5. καὶ γὰρ ἐπ[ὶ] ἡλάνεν καὶ πρὸς ἐκατέρους ὑπὲρ ἐκατέρων μάχεται καὶ διαμφισβητεῖ. The editor says 'the reading is very doubtful, with the exception of the first καί.' For ἐπ[ὶ] ἡλάνεν, which appears to give no sense, read ἐπαλλάττει. Cf. *Pol.* ii. 6, αἰτιον δὲ ταύτης τῆς ἀμφισβήτησεως καὶ ὁ ποιεῖ τοὺς λόγους ἐπαλλάττειν. **JBM., HR.** (the latter adding that it is a favourite word with Aristotle, which seems suitable to describe the attitude of a man who sees and takes both sides of a question at once, who is at home in both camps). ἐπ[ὶ] ἡλάνεν. **WR.** ἐπιβαλὼν. **R.** 'Cannot reconcile ἐπαλλάττει with MS.' **K.**

P. 14, l. 8. ἦν δ' ὁ Σόλων τῇ μὲν ῥήσει καὶ τῇ δόξῃ τῶν πρώτων, τῇ δ' οὐσίᾳ καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι τῶν μέσων. ῥήσει here being impossible, I thought of φύσει; and it seems

confirmed by p. 48, l. 10, οἱ καὶ [τῇ] φύσει τῶν ἐπιφανῶν...ἦσαν. This use of φύσις is perhaps against Aristotelian authorship. So is the use of τὰ πράγματα, unless *Pol.* i. 11, 12 be parallel. **HR., W.** citing Plutarch *Solon* c. 1, οὐσία μὲν καὶ δυνάμει μέσων τῶν πολιτῶν, οἰκίας δὲ πρώτης κατὰ γένος. 'φύσει is consistent with MS.' **K.**

P. 15, l. 5. οἱ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐς κόρον ἀάσατε. The last word is always used in a transitive sense, which seems here impossible. Should we correct ἡῖσατε, 'who have arrived at a plethora of wealth'? **JBM.** Dr. Postgate proposes the certain emendation ἡλάσατε, comparing Tyrtæus 11 (7), 10 ἀμφοτέρων δ' εἰς κόρον ἡλάσατε.

P. 15, l. 6. τ[ῇ] ῥέφεισθε. Read τ[ῇ] ἔφεισθε. **P.**

P. 15, l. 10. Reading θ' for τε we get Solon's pentameter τὴν τε φιλαργυρίαν τὴν θ' ὑπερηφανίαν, where the double τε suggests a poetical quotation. **JBM., J.** Cf. Plut. *Sol.* c. 14, § 3 ὁκνῶν φησι τὸ πρῶτον ἄψασθαι τῆς πολιτείας καὶ δεδοικῶς τῶν μὲν τὴν φιλοχρηματίαν τῶν δὲ τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν. We thus have δεδοικῶς τὴν φιλοχρηματίαν τὴν θ' ὑπερηφανίαν. **M.**

P. 15, last line. ἐν οἷς περὶ ὧν ταῖς [καὶ] διαβάλλειν αὐτόν. Read τινες for τὶ [καὶ]. **W.**

ἄς σειςάχθειαν καλοῦσιν, ὡς ἀποσεισάμενοι τὸ βάρος. The present καλοῦσιν can hardly refer to those who shook off the burden under Solon. I propose ἀποσεισαμένων gen. abs. **JBM.**

P. 16, l. 4. For [κεκτη]μένοι read [βουλό]μενοι, thus supplying a government for the following βλασφημεῖν, while the subsequent words depend on συνέβη at the beginning of the sentence. **JB., M., W.**

P. 16, l. 7. γινομένης. Read γενομένης. **R.**

P. 16, l. 11. For [ᾶμα] τ' ἐξόν, where the brackets show that ᾶμα is put in by Mr. Kenyon to represent something illegible, read ὥστ' ἐξόν. ᾶμα τε is quite ungrammatical. **HR., J.**, putting a comma after τῆς πολέως.

* c. 6 p. 16 l. 13 ἀπεχ[θάν]εσθαι...καί...[ποι]ήσασθαι. Obviously both verbs should be in the aorist and the ms. allows it. **M.** 'I think it would be possible to read ἀπεχθέσθαι. There is a lacuna after the χ, and if θ were written rather large, it would with the first part of the ε, be sufficient to fill it.' **K.**

P. 16, l. 17. μετεκρούσατο, said by the editor to be 'a very doubtful reading.' Read μεταχειρισάμενος ἴασατο, **JBM.,** μετεχειρίσατο, **S.**, citing Plat. *Rep.* 408 C ἰατροί...νοσώδεις μετεχειρίσαντο; *ib.* 346 E τὰ ἀλλότρια κακὰ μεταχειρίζεσθαι ἀνορθοῦντα. **HR.**'s suggestion of κατεπαύσατο seems hardly possible.

P. 16, l. 18. For μέμνηκε read μέμνηται. **Z.** 'I find that the MS. has μέμνηται.' **K.**

P. 17, last line. τόνδε τρόπον occurs without the article also in 82, 11, 97, 1. And so τοῦτον τρόπον in 28, last line but three, where the editor inserts τόν. No doubt this should be done in all cases, or τόνδε changed to τοιόνδε. **JBM., AS., W.**

P. 19, l. 8. τῆς οἰκείας. Read γῆς οἰκείας. **B.**

P. 20, l. 2. εἰκὼν Διφίλου. Insert 'Ανθεμίωσις: the statue dedicated by Anthemion could not have been one of his father Diphilus, who, as it appears, belonged to the class of Thetes, and therefore could not properly be represented with a horse beside him. The occurrence of the name below may have occasioned its omission here. **ASM.**

P. 20, l. 5. παρέστηκεν ἵππος ἐκμαρτυρῶν ὡς τὴν ἱππάδα τοῦτο σημαίνουσιν. The last five words are obelized. Is there any objection to taking them as an accusative absolute, as in p. 81 last line ὡς οὐ δημοτικὴν οὖσαν τὴν πολιτείαν? **JBM., M., AS.** ἐκμαρτυρῶν should have been marked as corrupt. **W.**

P. 24, l. 3. (οἶον [εἰκὸς] γέγραπται τοὺς ναυκράτους εἰσπράττειν. Omit round brackets, **JB.**; and read ὅσον for οἶον 'to exact as much as is fitting.' **JBM.**

P. 24, l. 4. We should perhaps read ἀργύριον for ἀργυρίον. **R.**

P. 24, l. 8. It is pretty plain that ἐς (sic) τὰ τε ἄλλα is not right. **R.** Cf. n. on p. 6.

P. 24, last line. τὰς ἐκτίσεις ἀνέφερεν εἰς πόλιν. Should we not read here εἰς ἀκρόπολιν as in p. 149, 6; or at least εἰς τὴν πόλιν if we suppose the author to have used the word in the old sense of acropolis? **JBM.**

P. 25, l. 6. (ὁρῶν) ἐνίους διὰ τὴν βαθυμίαν [ἀποστὰς] τὰς αὐτόματον νόμον ἔθηκε πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἴδιον. For τὸ αὐτόματον I propose τῶν πραγμάτων. **JBM.** Perhaps ἀποκνοῦντας τὸ αὐτόματον, **R.** ὑπομένοντας or περιμένοντας τὸ αὐτόματον 'letting things take their chance.' **Plut. Sol.** 20 says περιμένειν ἀκινδύνως τὰ τῶν κρατούντων. **ECM.** περιμένοντας or ἀγαπώντας. **M.** For [ἀποστὰς] τὰς αὐτόματον, we should expect [περιμένο]ντας τὸ ἀποβαίνον. **S.**

P. 25, l. 8. ὅς ἂν... μὴ αἰρηται τὰ ὅπλα μὴδὲ μεθ' ἑτέρων. Read μὴ αἰρηται, **W., μὴ τιθῆται, HR.**

P. 26, l. 2. [δικάζεσθαι.] Cf. **Plut. Sol.** c. 18, γράφεσθαι τὸν ἀδικούντα καὶ διώκειν. I first thought of γράφεσθαι, but now [τιμω-

ρεῖσθαι] seems the appropriate supplement. **W.**

P. 26, l. 7. From ἀλλ' ὥσπερ to ἐπικλήρων may be an adscript. **R.**

P. 27, l. 1. Solon is thought to have purposely made the laws obscure ὅπως τι τῆς κρίσεως [ἐ]χῃ [ὁ δῆμος κ] ὑρίος. Should we read διὰ τῆς κρίσεως ἐχῃ ὁ δῆμος τὸ κύριος? Cf. p. 94. 9 τὸ κύριος ὁ ἦν ἐν τοῖς δικασταῖς κατέλυσαν. I at first thought of εἴη ὁ δῆμος κύριος, but the writer seems always to keep the subjunctive in final sentences. **JBM.**

P. 27, l. 1. As μ' is the symbol for μετὰ in composition, we might venture to read τῆς κρίσεως μετέχῃ ὁ δῆμος κύριος. A participle seems required: can ὦν have fallen out before οὐ? **W.** For κύριος, read perhaps κυρίως, comparing p. 9, l. 3. **J.**

P. 27, l. 11. [ἐχ]οῦσα. The supplement should mean 'weighing': I thought of ἀγούσα and ἄκουσα, the former being the usual word. If βοῦς should be restored from Pollux on p. 57, l. 13, possibly διδράχμων <βοῦς>. **W.**

P. 27, l. 12. If παραπλήσιον is right we must read δραχμαῖς for δραχμαῖς. **R.**

P. 27, l. 13. Read ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ σταθμὸν πρὸς τὸ νόμισμα, ἑκατὸν δραχμῶν τὴν μνᾶν καὶ ἐξήκοντα μνᾶς τὸ τάλαντον. The corruption of ἑκατὸν δραχμῶν τὴν μνᾶν may have arisen from the words in an earlier copy being written tachygraphically as ρ<τ' μνᾶν. **R.** ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ σταθμὸν πρὸς τ[ὸ] νόμισμα *τ[ρ]εῖς καὶ *ἐξήκοντα μνᾶς τὸ τάλαντον ἀγούσας. **Mr. T. R. Glover**, Scholar of St. John's College, Cambridge, here suggests τιθεῖς καθ' ἐξήκοντα μνᾶς. **S.** 'τιθεῖς is possible, but καὶ is clearly written.' **K.**

P. 27, last four lines. Proposed reading: ἡ μνᾶ πρότερον μὲν ἔχουσα τρεῖς καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα δραχμῶν ἀνεπληρώθη ταῖς ἑκατόν. ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ σταθμὸν παραπλήσιον πρὸς τὸ νόμισμα, ἐξήκοντα μνᾶς τὸ τάλαντον ἀγούσας. To this I think there was a marginal gloss ἦν δὲ ὁ ἀρχαῖος χαρακτήρ βοῦς καὶ τὸ νόμισμα διδράχμων. **JBM.** **Mr. Kenyon** suggests that τρεῖς καὶ may have been written as an explanation of the indefinite παραπλήσιον as it stands before ἑβδομήκοντα, and then inserted in the wrong place.

On p. 27 we get some information about Solon's reforms in weights, measures and currency, as the writer says that after the Seisachtheia Solon increases the measures, weights, and currency (τὴν τε τῶν μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν καὶ τὴν τοῦ νομίσματος αὔξησιν.) For the measures were made greater than those of Pheidon (a fact of great importance for those who wrangle over the Attic foot), and the mina which heretofore contained 70

drachms was made up to 100. Then we are informed that the 'ancient stamp' was a didrachm; after which he adds ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ σταθμὸν πρὸς τὸ νόμισμα τρεῖς καὶ ἐξήκοντα μνᾶς τὸ τάλαντον ἀγούσας καὶ ἐπιδιενεμήθησαν αἱ μναὶ τῷ στατήρι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις σταθμοῖς. Mr. Kenyon thinks τρεῖς καὶ 'corrupt,' as there never was a talent with 63 minae. Now, as we are told by Plutarch that 73 (not 70) old drachms (Aeginetan drachms are, of course, meant) went to the talent, it is very tempting to suppose that τρεῖς καὶ really belong to ἐβδομήκοντα three lines above. But if this be done, there is no augmentation of weights effected. It is therefore, probably safer to take the reading as it stands, and to understand that Solon augmented the talent by adding three additional *old* minae, the new talent, of course, only having 60 minae, as the three additional minae were spread over all. The old stater of 129 grs. was thus raised to 135 grs., and so on proportionally in the case of the drachm and obol. **WR.**

P. 28, l. 1. Can ἐπιδιενεμήθησαν be right? **JBM.** l. 5. Read ἡνώχλουν.

P. 28, l. 7. ἀποδημίαν ἐλογίσασατο. Read προφασίσασατο, **JBM.**, ἐποίησας, **HE.**, citing p. 32, 18, where the same phrase recurs. Mr. Kenyon states that, after re-inspection of the MS., he believes the latter to be the true reading. [Corrected in ed. 2.]

P. 28, l. 8. For εἰς Αἰγυπτῶν [περὶ Κα] νόπου [πὸ]λ' εἰ δέκα ἐτῶν, perhaps εἰς Αἰγυπτῶν τὰ ὑπὲρ Κανώπου ὥσ' εἰ δέκα ἐτῶν. Cf. Plut. Sol. 26 (Bergk, fr. 28), Νείλον ἐπὶ προχοῇσι Κανωβίδος ἐγγύθεν ἀκτῆς **JBM.**

Read perhaps εἰς Αἰγυπτῶν [ἐπὶ Κα] νόπου [ὥσ] εἰ δέκα ἐτῶν. In the next sentence for δίκαιον read δίκαιος. **J.** The nom. c. infin. after δίκαιον εἶναι may perhaps be defended by Dem. 15 § 16 ὃν οὐδένος αὐτοὶ δοῦναι δίκην δίκαιον ἂν εἶναι (where, however, several editors prefer δίκαιοι ἂν, which involves a *hiatus*); and by Dem. *Proem.* p. 1439, 14 ἐγὼ μὲν δὴ δίκαιον ὑπέληφα πρῶτον πάντων αὐτὸς εἰπεῖν. In the text the construction after δίκαιον εἶναι is apparently identical with that frequently found after δεῖν (Rehdantz, *Indices Dem.* s.v. οἰεσθαι). **S.**

P. 28, l. 13. For ἀμφοτέρας read ἀμφοτέρους. **R.**

P. 28, l. 17. For [μέντοι] I should suggest Σόλων. **JBM.**

P. 28, l. 20. ἀπεχθεσθῆναι. Read ἀπεχθίσθαι. **W.** ἀπεχθίσθαι ἀνασώσας. **R.** 'There can be no doubt that ἀπεχθεσθῆναι is the MS. reading.' **K.**

P. 29, last line but two. For καὶ πάλιν διαγνώθῃ ποῦ λέγει read καὶ πάλιν δὲ

ἄλλοθί ποῦ λέγει, **JBM.**, **B.** ἐτέρωθί ποῦ, **RDH.**, **W.**, **S.** δὴ ἄλλοθί ποῦ. **JAS.** 'The δ is certain.' **K.**

P. 30, l. 8. θάκοισιν. Read κακοῖσιν. **N., P.** Mr. Kenyon believes this to be the true reading of the MS., which is rather rubbed here. [Corrected in ed. 2.]

P. 30, l. 13.

ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν μὲν οὐνεκ' ἀξονήλατον
δῆμόν τι τοῦτων πρὶν τυχῶν ἐπαυσά-
μην,
συμμαρτυροῖ, &c.

Obviously corrupt but, if ἀξονήλατον is sound, the general sense clear: 'Why I saved the afflicted people... may be my witness.'

Read

ἐγὼ δὲ τοῦ μὲν οὐνεκ' ἀξονήλατον
δῆμον, τοιοῦτων πρὶν τυχόντ', ἐπαυσα
νῦν, ...

where νῦν is in antithesis to πρὶν. **AS.**

Read εἵνεκα ξενήλατον (due to a friend). Mr. Wyse suggested ἐλυσάμην for ἐπανασάμην; perhaps ἐβρύσάμην would be nearer the MS. The whole must have been something like

ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν μὲν (!) εἵνεκα ξενήλατον
δῆμον παρουσῶν πημονῶν ἐβρύσάμην. **P.**

'οὔνεκα is clear. I think the letter after ξ is ο. The most doubtful is λ, which might be σ or γ. I have no doubt about ἐπανασάμην, but ἐλυσάμην is nearer the MS. than ἐβρύσάμην.' **K.**

P. 31, l. 4. πολλαχῇ πεπηγότα[s]. Perhaps πόλλ' ἔτη for the somewhat unmeaning πολλαχῇ. **JBM.**

P. 31, l. 5. I propose πρόσθεν γ' for πρόσθεν δὲ δουλεύουσα. The participle is not opposed to what precedes but gives a reason for συμμαρτυροῖ. **JBM.**

P. 31, l. 16. θεσμούς θ' ὁμοίως. Read θεσμούς δ' ὁμοίους with Bergk. **W.** 'Original τε corrected, I think, to θ.' **K.**

P. 32, l. 2. The MS. reads the highly corrupt passage

εἰ γὰρ ἤθελον
ἂ τοῖς ἐναντίοι [ισι]ν ἦνδανεν τότε
ἀθῆς δὲ αὐτοῖσιν ουτεραι φρασάαίτο,

where the text of Aristides reads for the last line

ἀθῆς δ' ἂ τοῖσιν ἀτέροις δρᾶσαι δίχα,

in which ἀτέροις, being an anapaest, is inadmissible. Now here τότε is superfluous, and I believe δίχα has got in from a gloss: I should propose

εἰ γὰρ ἤθελον
 ἂ τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἦνδαν ποιῶν
 αὐθις δ' ἂ χωρὶς ἄτεροι φρασάιτο,

so that χωρὶς is explained by δρᾶσαι δίχα.
AS. αὐθις δ' ἂ τοῖς οὐτεροι φρασάιτο, **P.**, observing however that the construction of ἤθελον remains a difficulty. Mr. Kenyon mentions that Bergk had already pointed out that ἄτεροι, the reading of Aristides, involves an unjustifiable quantity. Prof. Diels takes οὐτέρας as οἱ ἑτέρα.

P. 32, l. 4. ὦν οὐνεκ'. Should this be τῶν οὐνεκ', as in p. 30, l. 12? **JBM.** Yes. **K.**

P. 32, l. 4. ποιούμενος. Read ποιούμενος. Aristides has κικεύμενος in this passage. **P.** Also we have above, p. 31, 12, τρομεύμενοι.

P. 32, l. 8. διαφραδὴν. Read μ' ἀμφαδὴν. **P.**

P. 32, l. 4 from bottom. πρὶν ἂν ταραάας πῶαρ ἐξελεῖν γάλα. Read πρὶν ἀνταράάας πῶαρ ἐξεῖλεν γάλα. **AS.** Mr. Kenyon says ἐξεῖλεν is certain; ἂν is obliterated, and there is room, if needed, for more than two letters. [In the Corrigenda we find ἀνταράας and ἐξεῖλεν.]

P. 33, l. 1. The comma after ἀποδημήσαντος destroys the sense. **R.**

P. 33, l. 5. τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν ἀρχαίαν ἐποίησαν. Read διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν ἀναρχίαν ἐποίησαν. **H., JB., LC.** But can ἀναρχίαν ποιεῖν mean 'they left the state without an archon'?

Perhaps τὴν αὐτὴν αὐ ἀναρχίαν ἐποίησαν. [In this treatise the rule of the hiatus, though generally observed, appears to admit of occasional exceptions.] **J.**

P. 35, l. 5. A lacuna should be marked after ἀρχήν. **R.**

P. 36, l. 10, lege μετὰ τὴν τῶν τυράννων. **R.**

P. 36, last line but three. ἐποίησαν διαφημισμόν. Read διαψηφισμόν found in Athenaeus p. 218 A, and confirmed by διαψηφίζονται below, p. 107 last line. **S.**

P. 39, l. 1. οὐκ (or οὐδὲν) ἐπειθεν. **RDH.**

P. 40, l. 4. We should perhaps read καταξούσης. **R.**

c. 14 p. 41 l. 1. Read Παιανιέων **M., RDH.** 'Παιανιέων can be read; I confused the final stroke of the ν (which is obliterated) with the ι.' **K.**

P. 41, l. 3. Θρηῖτταν. Read Θραῖτταν. **AS.** 'Possible.' **K.**

P. 41, l. 11. κατέσχεν. Read κατείχεν. **W.**

P. 42, l. 8, lege παρείλετο δὲ. **R.**

P. 42, l. 11. [φωνῇ δ' ἐξεκλήσιν] αἰσεν μικρόν. Perhaps a more possible reading is φωνῇ δὲ μετεσκεύασεν μικράν. **JBM.** The word before μικρόν is perhaps κατεσκεύασεν. **R.**

P. 42, l. 15. ἐπὶ τούτων. Read ἐπὶ τούτῳ. **R., M.** comparing Plut. Sulla 14 § 10 Κουρίωνος ἐπὶ τούτῳ τεταγμένον. In p. 143, l. 7 the MS. has ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίων for Ἀθηναίῳ. 'The MS. has unquestionably ἐπὶ τούτων, but the corruption would be easy.' **K.**

P. 43, l. 2. ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων. Add μένεω, **JBM.,** or εἶναι, **ECM.,** who cites Aesch. iii. 8, Demosth. 15, 11; vi. 4; 26, 33, &c. Compare also l. 16 below. The sign for εἶναι is only a stroke \. Probably it has fallen out after ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων. **W.** Mr. Kenyon, on a re-examination of the MS., confirms the latter reading, which is given in the Corrigenda to ed. 2.

c. 15 f. p. 43 l. 2 οὐδ[ὲ] καταθυμείν. 'I believe the scribe wrote merely οὐδὲ θυμειν and δυσθυμείν, I quite agree, is probably preferable to καταθυμείν.' I had suggested to the Editor δυσθυμείν, because Aristotle uses δύσθυμος and δυσθυμία. **M.**

P. 43, l. 3. [αὐτῷ νῦν] μελήσεσθαι. Read αὐτὸς ἐπιμελήσεσθαι. **Z.**

P. 43, l. 11. προεδάνειζε χρήματα. Read προσεδάνειζε. **W., R.** But προhere seems more appropriate than προσ-. The money is lent beforehand to enable the farmers to cultivate the ground; it is not an additional loan. That there is no classical instance of its use is not an objection to it more than to many other words used in this treatise.

P. 43, l. 12. δια[μπε]ρὲς. Objected to by **HR.** and **W.** The former suggests διὰ παντός as possible. That ὥστε δια...ες ἐγεωργοῦντο is an adscript seems to be proved by the way in which the next sentence begins. **R.**

ἐγεωργοῦντο. Read ἐγεώργουν, **W., JAS.** **RDH.** See p. 44, 5.

P. 44, l. 14. παρώχλει. Read παρηνώχλει. **JBM., W.**

P. 44, l. 15. ἐτήρει δ[ε] ἡσυχίαν. Perhaps δι' ἡσυχίας, 'kept (the people) at rest.' **JBM.** 'I am inclined to think the MS. has τὴν not δι'.' **K.**

P. 44, l. 18. It is easy to see that the supplied words are wrong. **R.**

P. 44, l. 18. διὰ [τῆς ὕβρεως]. Read διὰ τὴν ὕβριν. **AS.**

P. 44, l. 20. μέγιστον δὲ πάντων ἦν [τῶν ἀρεσκῶ] μένων τὸ δημοτικὸν εἶναι τῷ ἦθει. For ἀρεσκομένων read ἐπαινομένων. **JBM., N.** κχαρισμένων is suggested by **HR.**

P. 44, last line. ἔμεινε [τυραννῶν, εἴ]τ' ἐκπέσοι πάλιν ἐπελάμβανε ραδίως. For εἴτ' read ὁπότε. **AS.** For ἐπελάμβανε read ἀπελάμβανε. **W.** Probably corrupt. There is no object after ἐπελάμβανε, and no infinitive after ἐβούλοντο. Perhaps ἔμεινε, [καὶ

δὴ καὶ ὁ π[ό]τ' ἐκπέσοι, πάλιν ἀπελάμβανε
 ραδίως <τὴν ἀρχήν>. **JBM.**

P. 45, l. 4. πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους ἐπεφύκει καλῶς
 can hardly stand as it is. Has τὰ ἄλλα been
 lost before it and ἡ τυραννίς at the end?
JBM.

P. 45, l. 4. [ᾠφέλησεν]. Read [ἐδημαγώ-
 γει]. Cp. Aristot. *Pol.* 5, 11, 33, 1315b 3
 sq.; 2, 9, 20, 1270b 13 sqq.; 5, 6, 6, 1305b
 23 sqq.; 5, 12, 1, 1315b 17 sq. **N.** Perhaps
 ἐθώπεν. **J.B.M.**

P. 45, l. 7. καθ[ή]κων πρὸς τῆς τυραννίδος.
 If καθήκων is right we must read either
 καθήκων πρὸς τὴν τυραννίδα or καθήκων ἣν πρὸς
 τῆς τυραννίδος. **R.** For πρὸς read perhaps
 περί. **W.**

P. 45, ll. 9—11. εἰν [τιν]ες τυραννείν
 ἐπ' αὐτοῖς [ἡ] ἐπὶ τυραννίδι τις συγκαθίστη
 τὴν τυραννίδα. This cannot be right. **W.** He
 suggests that ἡ should be read for τις. For
 the last two words **LC.** proposes τιν' ἐταυρείαν.
 Mr. Kenyon thinks ἐπὶ τυραννίδι a gloss on
 τυραννείν which crept into the text. He
 refers to the so-called Solonian law in
 Andoc. *De Myst.* p. 13, 13, εἰν τις τυραννείν
 ἐπαναστῇ ἢ τὸν τύραννον συγκαταστήσῃ.

Insert ἐπι<τιθῆται> before τυραννίδι, cf.
 Lyeurg. in Leocr. § 125, Aris. *Pol.* viii (v),
 c. 7 § 7, 1308 a 22, etc. **RDH.**

P. 45, l. 12. It is a great pity that the
 editor has seen fit to alter such excellent
 spellings as ἐγκατεγύρασε. **R.**

P. 45, l. 22. Read προάγοντες. **R.**

P. 45, l. 8 from bottom. Should it not be
 ἐφύγεν 'was in exile,' rather than ἐφυγεν
 'went into exile'? **JBM., R.**

P. 45, last line but one. κατεῖχον τὴν
 ἀρχὴν προαγαγόντες τὰ πράγματα τὸν
 αὐτὸν τρόπον. Below, p. 80, we have προάγειν
 (τὰς πολιτείας) ἕως μὴδὲν παρανομοῖεν. We
 want here, not προαγαγόντες, but a present
 participle to express 'carrying on.' **JBM.**

P. 46, l. 3. Θέτταλος for Θετταλὸς is still
 found even in the second edition here, and
 in ll. 7 and 21, and in l. 18 of p. 47. **R.**

P. 46, l. 9. κομίσαντος. One would have
 expected πείσαντος or Πεισιστράτῳ χαριζόμενοι.
JBM.

P. 46, l. 11. τῶν μὲν πραγμάτων. Omit
 μέν. **JBM.**

P. 47, l. 8. μετὰ πολιτῶν πολλῶν.
 In the note it is said the first letters of
 πολιτῶν are doubtful, and that according to
 Thucydides the conspirators were οὐ πολλοί.
 Should we read μετὰ συνειδότην οὐ
 πολλῶν? **JBM.**

P. 47. μετερχόμενος. Read καταρχόμενος.
HR., W. 'The μ is certain.' **K.**

P. 48, l. 5. [τὴν μὲν οὖν ὅλην] ἐλυμαί-
 νοντο πράξιν, αὐτῶν δ' ὁ μὲν Ἀρμόδιος εὐθὺς

ἐτελεύτησεν. The proposed filling up of the
 lacuna seems scarcely to explain the oppo-
 sition implied in the μὲν and following δέ.
 There is nothing to balance the general
 failure. Perhaps we should read οὕτως
 οὖν τὴν τε ὅλην and suppose the δέ to
 stand as an emphatic substitute for the more
 usual καί. **JBM.**

P. 48, l. 16. ἐπέμποντο. Read ἐπεμπον.
W.

P. 48, last line. For ἀγενεῖς read ἐναγεῖς.
HR., R. But would the act of putting to
 death the guiltless be in itself sufficient to
 entail a curse upon them? Perhaps ἀπεχθεῖς.
JBM.

P. 49. ἐκεῖ μεθιδρυσόμενος. For ἐκεῖ read
 ἐκείσε. **JBM., AS.**

P. 50, l. 13. With some diffidence I sug-
 gest ὅθεν εὐπόρησαν χρησμών (dele comma)
 πρὸς κ.τ.λ. If so in line 15 δέ must be re-
 placed by γάρ. How slight a change this is,
 γ' for δ', may be seen from the list of ab-
 breviations. **W.** 'The MS. is clear.' **K.**

P. 50, last line but three. εἰς τοῦτ' εὐθὺς.
 Corrupt. **AS.**

P. 51, l. 3. ἡττωθέντος. Read ἡττηθέντος.
Z. [Corrected in ed. 2.]

P. 51, l. 12. For ἐπεξιόντας read ὑπεξιόν-
 τας. **W.**

P. 51, last line. κατασχόντες τὴν τυραννίδα
 . . . ἔτη μάλιστα ἐπακαίδεκα. Should not
 the participle be the perfect? **JBM.**

P. 52, l. 2. ἐνὸς δ' εἰ. ἐνὸς δέ πεντήκοντα.
 Here and in c. 27 p. 75 l. 7 (ἐνὸς δέ πεντηκοστῷ
 ἔτει) read δαίν, as in the rhet. ii 14 f. where
 even Cope takes δαίν as that for δέον, which
 Kühner (also in the new edition by Blass)
 denounces as a Byzantine barbarism. πλείν
 is for πλείον not for πλέον. It is remark-
 able that this numerical expression (= unde-
 quingaginta) has escaped lexicographers and
 grammarians. **M., AS.**

P. 52, l. 8. ἐπιλειπόμενος τῇ δυνάμει.
 Read ἀπολειπόμενος here and also in 76, l. 6
 and 93, l. 5. **HR.** Perhaps ὑπολειπόμενος.
CEH.

P. 53, last line. Omit οὖν, reading per-
 haps διένειμε for ἐνειμε. **W.**

P. 56, l. 7. οὐ γὰρ ἅπαντες ἐπὶ ἡρχον
 ἐτι τοῖς τόποις. I think we should read ἅπα-
 σιν as the editor suggests. If we keep ἅπαν-
 τες, it can only refer to the δῆμοι which had
 just been divided into two classes. If we
 read ἅπασιν, we naturally supply οἱ κτίσαντες
 as the subject of the verb, 'the names of the
 founders were sometimes irrecoverable.'
JBM.

P. 57, l. 1. ταῖς δὲ φυλαῖς ἐποίησεν ἐπ' οὐ-
 νυμ[ί]ας ἐκ τῶν προκριθέντων ἑκατὸν ἀρχηγ-
 τῶν οὓς ἀνέλειν ἢ Πυθία δέκα. For ἐπωνυμίας

read ἐπ'ωνύμους, agreeing with the following οὗς. **JBM., R.**

P. 57, l. 2. δέκα is perhaps an adscript. **R.**

P. 58, l. 4. καταλιπόντες ἔτη δύο. Read διαλιπόντες. **W.**

P. 59, l. 4. συνέξημάρτανον. **AS., W.** [Corrected in ed. 2.]

P. 60, l. 1. Should we not read τοὺς μετὰ τὴν τυραννίδα, instead of τοῖς? **JBM.**

Ch. 22, p. 61. ἐκυάμευσαν τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας κατὰ φυλὰς ἐκ τῶν προκρίθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν πεντακοσίων. As Mr. Kenyon points out, this contradicts the statement of ch. 8, that each tribe chose ten candidates, so that the total would be 100. We want also some statement as to the qualification for the archonship. I should suspect therefore that πεντακοσίων is a corruption for πεντακοσιμεδίωνων. δημοτῶν is also inconsistent with a statement in ch. 62. The whole passage should probably be ἐκ τῶν προκρίθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ δημοῦ [ἐκ] τῶν πεντακοσιμεδίωνων. **JWH.**

P. 61, l. 7. ὡς ἐφάνη τὰ μέταλλα τὰ ἐν Μαριωνείᾳ. ἐφάνη is a singular expression. Is it possible that ἀπεγράφη is the word? See Suid. s.v. ἀγράφου μετάλλου δίκη; Hyper. Euz. col. xliii. ἐξ ἀναπογρ[άφ]ων μετάλλων π(επ)λοπτήκασι; C.I.A. ii. 783, 8 ἀπεγράφατο [κα]ίνου[ομι]αν [ἐπ]ι [Μ]α[ριωνείᾳ]; Harp. s.v. διαγραφῆ. **W.**

P. 63, l. 1. οὐ λέγον ὅτι χρήσεται τοῖς χρήμασιν ἀλλὰ δανείσαις κελεύων. For ὅτι read ὅτι. **JBM., W., AS.**

P. 63, l. 3. A comma after ἀνάλομα. **AS.**

P. 64, l. 1. παρακομίσασθαι τὰ χρήματα. Should not this be ἀνακομίσασθαι, 'to recover'? **JBM.** Both Landwehr and Diels give κομίσασθαι as the reading of the Berlin fragment. The un-compounded verb is preferable. **W.** 'κομίσασθαι is the true reading.' **K.**

P. 64, l. 10. τὸ λοιπὸν ὄρισαν τοῖς ὀστρακιζομένοις ἐν τῷ Γεραιστοῦ καὶ Σκυλλαίου κατωκεῖν. As Argos is west of Scyllaeum and Samos east of Geraestus, these cannot have been the extreme western and eastern limits of residence in the sense suggested in the editor's note. Read ἐκτός. **W.** Mr. Wyse's correction, ἐκτός, is confirmed by the *Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense* (s.v. ὀστρακισμοῦ τρόπος)...μή ἐπιβαίνοντα ἐντὸς Γεραιστοῦ (Dobree's emendation for Πέρα τοῦ) Εὐβοίας ἀκρωτηρίου. **S.**

P. 64, last line but two. Ξέρξου στρατιάν. Read στρατείαν. **B., LC.**

P. 65, l. 7. Is εξαπορήσαντες τοῖς πράγμασιν Greek? **R.**

P. 65, l. 10. παρεχώρουν αὐτῇ τῷ ἀξιώματι. Queried by **W.** The MS. has αὐτῇ. *Lege* παρεχώρουν αὐτῆς ἀξιώματι. **R.** On **M.**'s sug-

gestion τοῦ ἀξιώματος Mr. Kenyon remarks: 'τῷ ἀξιώματι is the MS. reading; could it not mean "they gave place to it in rank" or "position"?'

P. 66, l. 2. ἀκόντων τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων. The writer is praising the Athenian government of that period and describing the general popularity of Athens. Would it not be striking a false note to say that Sparta was opposed to their hegemony? Moreover it is inconsistent with the account given by Thucydides i. 95 and Xen. *Hell.* vi. 5, 34 where a Spartan declares that the Athenians were chosen leaders at sea, τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων συμβουλευομένων. Read therefore ἐκόντων. **JBM.**

P. 66, last line but two. Τιμοσθένων. Read Τιμοσθένους. **B.** 'MS. admits of this.' **K.**

P. 68, l. 9. ἀλλαι δὲ νῆες αἱ τοῖς φόροις ἔχουσαι τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κνάμου διαχιλίους ἄνδρας. Insert ἐπὶ before τοῖς φόροις. **JBM.**

P. 69, l. 6. Σωφρονίδου. Read Σοφωνίδου or Σωφρονίδου. **AS.** Aelian (v.h. ii. 43. iii. 17. xi. 9) calls the father of Ephialtes Sophonides, which name must now be substituted for Simonides in Diod. *Sic.* xi. 776. **M.** 'The MS. admits of this.' **K.**

P. 71, l. 8. τοὺς ἀθροισμένους. Read αὐτοῖς. **R.**

P. 72, l. 7. καὶ ἀληγρέθη δὲ καὶ ὁ Εφιάλης. Omit first καί. **JBM.**

P. 73, l. 8. τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα πάντα διόκων οὐχ ὁμοίως καὶ πρότερον τοῖς νόμοις προσέχοντες. Omit οὐχ as a dittography. **W.**

This however is not very consistent with the following words τὴν δὲ τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων αἵρεσιν οὐκ ἐκίνουν, 'On the one hand they managed all the rest as before according to the laws, but on the other hand they did not disturb the election of the archons.' To avoid this we must, I think, make a further change, and insert after αἵρεσιν the words τὸ μὲν εἶθός or something of the kind, preparing for the following ἀλλ' ἔκτω ἔτει κ.τ.λ. **JBM.**

P. 74, l. 3, *lege* οἱ καλούμενοι οἱ κατὰ δῆμους. **R.**

P. 74 l. 4. καὶ τρίτῳ μετ' αὐτὸν ἐπὶ Ἀντιόχου: read κ. τ. μ. αὐτ. ἔπει ἐπὶ Ἀ. **M.**

P. 74, l. 8. πρώτου. Read πρῶτον. **R., LC.** For πρῶτον read πρὸ τοῦ. **J.**

P. 75, l. 7. ἐνὸς δεῖ. Read δεῖν as in p. 52, 2. **M.**

P. 75, l. 10. στρατίαις. Read στρατείας. **B., LC.**

P. 76, l. 4. τὰ χωρία πάντα ἀφρακτα ἦν, ὅπως ἐξ ἦν τῷ βουλευμένῳ τῆς ὁπώρας ἀπολαύειν. The editor's note is 'this is the reading of the MS. though it may be questioned whether we should not read ἐξῆ.'

The imperfect indicative is impossible. **W.** For the superfluous *v* cf. p. 42, l. 15 above. **M.** If it were stated that Cimon pulled down his fences in order to allow the people to enter his orchards, the subjunctive with *ὅπως* would naturally follow, but here it is simply stated as a fact that there was not, perhaps never had been, a fence—so that it was possible for people to enter. I should therefore prefer to read *ὥστε ἐξῆν* **JBM.**

P. 76, l. 5. ἐπιλειπόμενος. Read ἀπολειπόμενος. **HB.**

P. 76, l. 7. τῶν πολέμων εἰσηγητής. Read πολιτικῶν. **W.** Cf. Pl. *Pericles* c. 4, τῷ δὲ Περικλεῖ συνὴν καθάπερ ἀθλητῇ τῶν πολιτικῶν ἀλείπτῃς καὶ διδάσκαλος. Probably Plutarch wrote with this treatise before him.

P. 76, l. 7. Οἴθεν: in other parts of the book such words are accented properisponenon. **R.**

P. 76, l. 11. χεῖρω γενέσθαι. Add τὰ πράγματα or τὰ κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν, as in the last line. **JBM.**

P. 76, l. 11. Mark some word or words lost after γενέσθαι, either τὴν πόλιν or τὰ πράγματα. **R.**

P. 77, l. 3. οὐκ εἰδοκιμοῦντα τὰ παρὰ τοῖς ἐπικέσιν. Omit τὰ. **JBM., W., WR.** See p. 109, l. 8, where τὰ is omitted by Harpocration. **M.**

P. 77, l. 15. τῶν ἐτέρων. Read τῶν ἐσθλῶν. The same corruption on p. 78, l. 5. **W.** Query ἐπικεῶν in both. **M.** Mr. Kenyon says: 'The MS. is clear, and I should have thought that, considering the context, the word was not unnatural. A. is giving a list of the προστάται τοῦ δήμου, and concurrently of the leaders on the other side; and he uses various synonyms to express the conservative party, among which that of the *other party*, or the *opposition*, seems to me not unreasonable.'

P. 78, l. 1. διαφθεῖραι τὸν δῆμον ταῖς ὁρμαῖς. If this is the right reading, we may compare Plut. i 1012, πρῶτος καὶ ταῖς ὁρμαῖς φύσει μαλακώτερος, but perhaps some such words as ἐκάστοτε χαρίζομενος have been lost after ὁρμαῖς (sc. τοῦ δήμου), which is barely intelligible by itself ('through his impulsiveness'?). **JBM.**

P. 78, l. 3. περιζωσάμενος ἐδημηγόρησε. Plutarch (*Nic.* 9) has περισπάσας τὸ ἱμάτιον. See Dr. Holden's note. This shows that Rose was on the right track when he observed (*Ar. Ps.* p. 424) 'debebat ἐντὸς τὴν χεῖρα ἔχειν,' and that the tempting correction περιζωσάμενος is wrong. **W.**

P. 78, l. 7. διεδίδου. Apparently corrupt. διεδίδοτο? **W., R.**

P. 79, l. 4. προσαγαγόντας. Read προαγαγόντας. **N., R.**

P. 79, l. 9. Read δοκοῦσι δὲ καὶ βέλτιστοι. **R.**

P. 80, l. 5. ἀμφισβήτησις τῆς κρίσεως. Read perhaps *τις* for *τῆς*? **W.**

P. 80, l. 15. ἰσχυρότατα. Should this be ἰσχυρότερα? **JBM.**

P. 80, l. 18. τὸν μὲν πρὸ τοῦ ψηφίσματος λόγον. I suspect *περὶ* to be the true reading. **W.**

P. 81, l. 1. διὰ τὸ νομίζειν βασιλέα [ἄσμενο]ν ἑαυτοῖς συμβουλευόμεν. Read μᾶλλον. **JBM.** μέλλειν. **ECM.**

P. 81, l. 8. For συγγράφουσι *περὶ* τῆς σωτηρίας read συμβουλευόσονται *περὶ* τῆς σωτηρίας. **R.**

P. 82, l. 5. τὰς προκλήσεις ἀνείλον ὅπως ἂν οἱ ἐθέλοντες Ἀθηναῖοι συμβουλευώσι. Read προσκλήσεις. **W.** Read Ἀθηναίων. **M.**

P. 82, l. 11. τόνδε τρόπον. See on p. 17.

P. 82, l. 13. ἅπαντας suits the context better than ἀπάσας. **R.**

P. 82, last line but two. τὴν δ' ἄλλην πολιτείαν ἐπιτρέψαι πᾶσιν Ἀθηναίων τοῖς δυνατοτάτοις. Read *πάναν*. **JBM., N.**

P. 85, l. 9. εἰάν MS., *κᾶν* text. Rather εἰάν δέ. **JBM.**

P. 86, l. 1. Cf. p. 113, 3 κήρυξιν καὶ πρεσβεία. Read *πρεσβείας* here also. **W.**

P. 87, l. 9. τὴν δὲ βουλὴν ἐπειδὴν κατὰ στήσιν. Should not we read *καταστή* 'when it is constituted'? For the present (τὸ νῦν εἶναι) the election is to be in the hands of the 5000, but afterwards, as it is said below, the council will elect according to the law. **JBM., W.** ἐξέτασιν ὅπλοισι. Read ὅπλων. **R.** ἐν ὅπλοις. **W.**

P. 87, l. 11. ἀρχειν τὸν εἰσιόντα ἐνιαυτόν. Perhaps ἐπιόντα, as it is the whole year, not the commencement, which is spoken of. **JBM.**

P. 88. εἰς δὲ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον ἵνα νεμηθῶσιν οἱ τετρακόςιοι εἰς τὰς τέτταρας λήξεις *ὅταν τοῖς ἀστοῖς γίνηται μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων βουλευέιν, διανεμάντων αὐτοῖς οἱ ἑκατὸν ἄνδρες.*

At the beginning of ch. 30 it is stated that the 5,000 elected a board of 100 men to draw up the constitution. Shortly afterwards it appears that one of the duties of the latter is to arrange four councils of 100 each. In ch. 31 it is stated that the constitution cannot be immediately put into operation, and we have a list of regulations for the intermediate time, with the verb in the infinitive mood. In the above sentence, which closes the chapter, the infinitive is changed into the direct imperative. In the note it is said to be 'manifestly corrupt,' but I see no objection to translating 'As regards the future,

in order that the 400 may be distributed into the four divisions (above mentioned), let the hundred make the distribution when it is possible for the citizens to sit in council with the rest' (those, I presume, who are now manning the fleet). Should we read here τοῖς ἐν ἄστει for τ. ἀστοῖς, or are we to distinguish between ἀστοί and πολῖται? **JBM.**

P. 88, l. 9. Read ἡ μὲν βουλὴ ἡ ἐπὶ Καλλίου. **R.**

P. 90, l. 9. ἀρχὴν εἶναι μισθοφόρων. Read α. ε. μισθοφόρον, as we have above, p. 75, l. 12 ἐποίησε μισθοφόρα τὰ δικαστήρια, compare p. 82, l. 13 τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς ἀμίσθους ἀρχεν. **JBM., R.**

P. 91, l. 8. For ἀνέναι read ἀπέναι. **JBM., AS.** (the latter referring to Rose fr. 370 quoted next page).

P. 91, l. 10. Read ἐξαπατηθέν. **R.**

P. 92, l. 4. χωρησάμενοι. Read χρησάμενοι. **Z.** So in MS. and in Corrigenda to ed. 2.

P. 93, l. 1. διασώσκειν ἐπειρώοντο. Read διασώσσαι. **JBM., W.**

P. 93, l. 13. ὀλιγαρχίαν ἐπεθύμουν. Read ὀλιγαρχίας. **JBM., R.** 'Not in MS., but corrected in ed. 2.' **K.**

P. 93, l. 5. ἐπιλείπεσθαι. Read ἀπολείπεσθαι. **HR.**

P. 94, l. 3. δι' ἐαυτῶν. Should this be δι' αὐτῶν, referring to the μαστιγοφόροι just mentioned? **JBM.**

P. 94, l. 3. ὑπρέτας seems to be an adscript to μαστιγοφόρους. **R.**

P. 94, l. 10. Supply ἕκαστον before or after κύριον. **R.**

P. 95, l. 1. μανῶν ἢ γηρῶν. The law is known from [Dem.] 46 § 14, p. 1133, 11, ἐὰν μὴ μανῶν ἢ γήρως ἢ φαρμάκων ἢ νόσου ἔνεκα, ἢ γυναικὶ παιδόμενος κ.τ.λ. Here therefore correct γηρῶν to γήρως <ἔνεκα>, and possibly the aorist participle to the present. **W.**

P. 95, l. 7. ἔχαιρον. Read ἔχαιρεν. **AS., R.**

P. 95, l. 14. χρόνον διαπεσόντος. Read διαλιπόντος. **JBM.**

P. 96, line 2 from bottom. Transpose οἱ τριάκοντα before ἔγνωσαν. The preceding καὶ joins the participles καταλαβόντος and ἀποχωρήσαντες. **JBM.**

P. 97, l. 1. τόνδε τρόπον. See on p. 17.

P. 97, last line, κατασκευάσασσι. **RDH.**

P. 98, l. 7. Insert δέ after πρέσβεις. **JBM., AS.**

P. 99, l. 1. ἐν οἷς μὲν ἡρέθησαν οὐκ ἐπραττον. The editor's suggested ἐφ' οἷς must of course be accepted.

P. 99, l. 8. For βεβαίως read βιαίως. **JBM.**

P. 100, l. 1. ὁ Ἀχέρδους υἱός. Read Ἀχερδούσιος. Phayllus was of the deme called Ἀχερδούς, as Rhinon was of that of Παιανία. **B.**

P. 100, l. 2. Omit τ' after Πανσανίαν. **JBM.**

P. 100, l. 4. For ἐπὶ πέρας γὰρ ἤγαγε we should perhaps read ἐπιμελῶς γὰρ ἤπειγε. **JBM.**

P. 100, l. 11. τῇ δημοκρατίᾳ. Perhaps ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ. **W.** 'Possible.' **K.**

P. 100, l. 15. ἐπ' Εὐκλειδοῦς ἀρχontos. Read Εὐκλείδου. **B.** 'So MS.' **K.** Even in the second edition Εὐκλείδους is not corrected in form though it is in accent. **R.**

P. 100, l. 17. τοῖς βουλομένοις τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν ἄστει μινάντων ἐξουκύν ἔχεν Ἐλευσίνα. Insert τῶν before ἐν ἄστει, and for following ἔχεν read perhaps ἐξέναι εἰς. **JBM.** 'Not in MS., but Ἀθηναίων is a later insertion above the line, so that one could either omit it altogether or insert τῶν in addition.' **K.**

P. 100, l. 18. ἐπιτίμους ὄντας καὶ κυρίους καὶ αὐτοκράτορας ἐπὶ πᾶσι καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν καρπουμένους. Is ἐπὶ πᾶσι right? ἐαυτῶν has occurred to me. **J.**

P. 100, l. 22. μὴ ἐξέναι δὲ μήτε τοῖς Ἐλευσινώθεν εἰς τὸ ἄστυ μήτε τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ ἁστέως Ἐλευσινάδε ἰέναι πλὴν μυστηρίους ἑκατέρους.

ἑκατέρους might perhaps be defended or excused: but should we not read μυστηρίους ἑκατέρους, 'at the mysteries, greater and less'? **J.**

P. 101, l. 13. Unless we are prepared to sanction πρὶν with the subjunctive in Attic prose we must correct πρὶν ἀπογράφηται to πρὶν ἂν ἀπογράφηται. **W.** 'So MS.' **K.**

P. 101, l. 15. εἰ τίς τινα αὐτοχειρὶ <ἀπεκτονεν> ἐκτίσει ἱερώσας. The proposed reading is inconsistent with the usages of tenses and moods throughout the document. **JAS.**

Read εἰ τίς τινα ἀποκτείνας ἐκτίσει ἱερώσας. **R.** Possibly αὐτοχειρία, and in line 17 ἡ τρώσας, are worth recording as provisional suggestions, pending an examination of the papyrus.

W. 'The MS. has been corrected to ἱερώσας. The original writing cannot be deciphered.' **K.**

P. 102, l. 7. ἀναγραφὴν. Read ἀπογραφὴν. **W., J.**

P. 103, l. 13. ἅμα should probably be ἀλλὰ. **HR.** 'Possible.' **K.** τὰ τε ἄλλα would read better. **JBM.**

P. 103, l. 14. καρδίᾳ καὶ κοινῇ. Read καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ κοινῇ. **Z.** So Corrigenda.

P. 103, l. 15. For προγεγενημέναις read προσγεγενημέναις. **W.**

P. 103, l. 21. ἄρχειν μὲν τῆς ὁμονοίας. 'μεν: MS. δεν.' Perhaps ἄρχειν δὲ ἐν. **W.**

For μὲν (MS. δὲν) read δαῖν. Cp. Demosth. in *Leptin.* c. 12 (referring to the same matter), τῶν δὲ τοῦτο πρῶτον ὑπάρξει τῆς ὁμονομίας σημεῖον ἀξιούντων. **N.** 'I think an ι has been inserted correcting δὲν to δαῖν.' **K.**

P. 103, l. 22. For ἔτι read ἔσθ' ὁ τι. **R.** Is it possible that the original was οὐχ ὅτι, and that the latter word having been corrupted to ἔτι, οἶον was inserted by a later scribe? **JBM.**

P. 103, last line. οἱ δημοκρατήσαντες. Read δημοκρατησάμενοι. **M.**

P. 104, l. 8. ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρον μὲν ἄρχοντας, [δ]οκούντος δὲ δικαίως τοῦ δήμου λαβεῖν τὴν [ἐξουσίαν] διὰ τὸ ποιήσασθαι τὴν καθόδον δι' αὐτὸν τὸν δῆμον. This certainly cannot stand: we must at least read αὐτοῦ for αὐτόν. In the note, however, it is suggested that Θρασυβούλου should be read instead of the former δῆμον, προστασίαν for ἐξουσίαν, and αὐτόν for αὐτόν. If we accept this I should still prefer the genitive αὐτοῦ. **JBM.**

P. 104, l. 13. μετ' αὐτοῦ. Perhaps μετ' αὐτόν. **W.**

P. 105, l. 1. δευτέρα δὲ καὶ πρώτη μετὰ ταῦτα [ἐξ]έχουσα πολιτείας τάξις ἢ ἐπὶ Θρησέως. (MS. πολιτείας τάξιν). Read δευτέρα δὲ ἦν ἢ καὶ πρώτη μ.τ. μέτεχουσα κ.τ.λ. **JBM.** With some hesitation I propose παρέχουσα πολιτείας τάξιν. **W.** παρέχουσα πολιτείας τάξις. **R.**

P. 105, last line but two. Should we read ἢ for καί? **JBM.**

P. 106, l. 4. καὶ μετὰ ταύτην ἐνάτη δὲ [δ]ημοκρατία πάλιν. Omit δέ. **JBM.**

P. 107, l. 9. Read, or rather divide, thus: ὅταν δ' ἐγγράφονται. **W., AS., HR.**

P. 108, l. 4. Another confusion of prepositions. For ἐπιψηφίσονται read ἀποψηφίσονται. **W.**

P. 108, l. 13. [εἰς τὰς φυλάς. Possibly it should be κατὰ φυλάς. **W.** 'Yes.' **K.**

P. 108, l. 19. [ἐπιμ]ελήτην ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ πάντα. Corrupt. **AS.** Omit ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων Ἀθηναίων which is due to an adscript upon ὁ δῆμος two lines above ὡς τῶν ἄλλων Ἀθηναίων. **R.**

P. 108, l. 21. Is περιήλθον right? Perhaps περίαισιν. **S.**

P. 108, last line but one. [οἷ]τινες ... διδάσκουσιν. Read διδάξουσιν. **R.**

P. 109, l. 6. I am inclined to read ἐξασκοῦσι rather than διάγουσι, and perhaps δεύτερον l. 7. **W.**

P. 109, l. 13. ἵνα μὴ πράγμασι συμμιγείν τι. Read συμμιγῶσιν τι. **AS.** Read συμμιγνύονται. **JBM.** Read μὴ πράγμασι συγγίνονται. **R.** 'The termination ειν is clear.' **K.**

P. 110, l. 7. I know of no authority for τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν θεωρικῶν, gen. plur., for Dem. 18, 55 and 118 are not genuine documents. The dative singular would be the easiest correction. But p. 120 l. 1 we have the quite well attested phrase τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν (cf. Aesch. 3. 25). In *C. I. A.* ii. 114 C vs. 5 the right reading is doubtful. **W.** 'The MS. has τὸ θεωρικόν.' **K.**

Ch. 43, p. 110. τοῦ τῶν κρηνῶν ἐπιμελητοῦ. Mr. Kenyon's note is not quite correct, as the title does occur once in the *Politics*, though not in any particular connection with Athens (*Polit.* vii. 5, 3, 1321b, 26). It is however very remarkable that we find in this work no mention of the well-known official called sometimes ταμίης τῆς κοινῆς προσόδου, sometimes ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοίκησει. This is the more noticeable as the work was written just after the administration of Lycurgus, in whose time the office became of exceptional importance. Now in this passage he has just mentioned two other officials, ὁ ταμίης τῶν στρατιωτικῶν and οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν θεωρικῶν, both of whom had financial duties. The word διοίκησις also is generally used of business. It is strange, then, to find the ἐπιμελητὴς τῶν κρηνῶν associated with men whose duties were so entirely unconnected with his. I expect therefore that for κρηνῶν we should read κοινῶν, and that the title is another name for ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοίκησει. **JWH.**

P. 111, l. 5. I think εἰς must be omitted after συνάγουσιν, as in Harpocration (*s.v.* κυρία ἐκκλησία). The phrase συναγ. εἰς βουλὴν does not, I think, occur elsewhere, and it is certainly inappropriate for the following δῆμον. Cf. p. 113, last line but one. **JBM.** And in Pollux viii. 96 it is ὅταν οἱ πρυτάνεις τὸν δῆμον ἢ τὴν βουλὴν συνάγῃ. **W.**

P. 111, l. 7. τὴν μὲν οὖν βουλὴν ὁσημέραι, πλὴν ἐάν τις ἀφέσιμος ᾖ. I should keep the ὅσαι ἡμέραι of the MS., as it facilitates the following τις. **JBM.**

P. 112, l. 14. ὧν ἂν βούληται. Perhaps περὶ ὧν ἂν βούληται. περὶ in MS. is sometimes π'. **W.** 'But this hand uses no abbreviation.' **K.**

P. 116, l. 8. ποιούσι δὲ καὶ δεκαρχαιρείας. The syllable δεκ is probably a careless repetition of the preceding δὲ καί, which, according to the table of abbreviations, would presumably be written δεκ'. **S.**

P. 117, l. 3 foll. ἢ δὲ βουλὴ πρότερον μὲν ἦν κυρία...καὶ δῆσαι καὶ ἀποκτεῖναι. καὶ Ἀνσίμαχον αὐτῆς ἀγαγούσης ὡς τὸν δῆμιον καθήμενον ἤδη μέλλοντα ἀποθνήσκειν Εὐμηλείδης...ἀφείλετο. There are several difficulties in the second sentence. We

should have expected a clause with $\delta\epsilon$ answering to $\pi\rho\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$. Then the phrase $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\upsilon$ $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\delta\acute{\eta}\mu\omicron\nu$ used of the council in respect to their slave, the public executioner, seems to me very extraordinary. I should have expected $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$ $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\delta\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\omega$. Cf. Lys. 135, 62 $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\psi\eta\phi\iota\sigma\acute{\tau}\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\delta\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\omega$ $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\mu\pi\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\eta$. The following $\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$, reminding one of the phrase $\acute{\omicron}$ $\delta\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, makes one wonder whether we should read $\delta\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ for $\delta\acute{\eta}\mu\omicron\nu$. If on the other hand $\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$ agrees with $\Lambda\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\chi\omicron\nu$, it does not seem a suitable word for one in the position described, just about to suffer the punishment of $\tau\upsilon\mu\pi\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (compare $\acute{\omicron}$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\upsilon$ below). Should we read $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$ for $\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$, and insert $\kappa\alpha\iota$ before $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$? Probably $\acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ must be taken in the sense of 'rescued,' not as in l. 11, $\acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\omicron}$ $\theta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$. **JBM.**

P. 117, l. 14. Is $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\zeta\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ right after $\zeta\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\eta$ in the preceding line? **W.**

P. 119, l. 8. Here, and at line 14, read $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ δ' $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\langle\acute{\kappa}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\rangle$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\phi\upsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma$. Cf. p. 149 note. **W.**

P. 120, l. 5. $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\acute{\Lambda}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omicron\nu$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\nu$ $\phi\epsilon\nu\gamma\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\omicron\nu$... $[\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma$ $\pi\omega\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$. Possibly the blank may be filled by $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\nu$. One of the forms of $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ was followed by confiscation, and we know from Harpocration, who refers to this treatise in his article on $\pi\omega\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}$, that among their duties was the sale of $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\delta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$. **S.**

P. 120, l. 9. $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\pi\rho$... $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\eta\tau\alpha\iota$. Perhaps the corruption here may have arisen from misunderstanding some contraction of $\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$. **R.**

P. 120, l. 16. $[\tau\alpha$ $\mu\iota\sigma\theta\omega\beta\acute{\iota}\nu\tau\alpha$. Perhaps $[\tau\alpha$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\nu\tau\alpha$. **W.**

P. 120, l. 21. Cf. [Dem.] 43 § 58 s. f. $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\mu\grave{\eta}$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\delta\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\mu\iota\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu$. Restore $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\mu\iota\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\zeta\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu$ here. **W.**

P. 120, l. 22. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega$... $\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$. Read $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$ $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu\kappa\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$, comparing l. 9. **J.**

P. 121, l. 10. Read $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\pi\eta$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\eta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota$. **R.**

P. 121, l. 18. $\kappa\alpha\iota$... $\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\eta$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\tau\iota\nu\alpha$ $\omicron\iota\delta\epsilon\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha$. The lacuna may perhaps be filled with the words $[\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ $\delta\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$. Cf. 139—6, $\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$. **JBM.** Perhaps $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$. **S.**

P. 122, l. 8. Read $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ for $[\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\beta\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$. **W.**

P. 122, ll. 18, 19. For $\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\epsilon\upsilon$ in these lines read $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$. If a charger was in good condition but unmanageable, he was mulcted in his allowance of corn. If he could not go,

or would not stand still when bidden, he was marked with \odot as unfit for service. **LC.**

P. 122, l. 20. $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ $\tau\rho\omicron\chi\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\tau\eta\nu$...Read $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ (or $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$) $\tau\rho\omicron\chi\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\pi\upsilon\gamma\eta\nu$. **LC.**

Read $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\eta\omega\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\delta\omicron\kappa\eta$ $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\upsilon$, $\zeta\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\iota$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\sigma\acute{\iota}\tau\omega$ (the Boule stops his allowance). Cf. Harpoer. and Suidas s. v. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$. **W.**

20, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ $\tau\rho\omicron\chi\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\tau\eta\nu$... (see the editor's note), 'what is the whole process spoken of' may be learnt from Hesych, s. v. $\tau\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\iota\omega\nu$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\alpha$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ $\delta\omicron\kappa\mu\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\upsilon[\mu\acute{\iota}]$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$... (here Hesychius is defective) $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ $\mu\eta\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha\iota$. $\tau\rho\omicron\chi\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\eta\nu$ $\acute{\omicron}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta\alpha\lambda\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\chi\omega\rho\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ $\tau\eta$ $\gamma\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\omega$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omega\nu$. Cf. also Photius s. v. $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\rho\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$, Eustath. 1517, 8, whose explanation of $\tau\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\iota\omega\nu$ is $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa\alpha\nu\mu\alpha$ $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omega\nu$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\gamma\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\omega$, $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\iota\omega\nu$ $\tau\rho\omicron\chi\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, and Pollux 7, 186.

Read $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ $\tau\rho\omicron\chi\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\gamma\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\omega$, 'the Bouleutae put a circular brand on the jaw' of the rejected horses. (For change from singular to plural cf. p. 123, ll. 14 and 16.) **RDH.**

In l. 19 $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\upsilon$ has no sense as applied to the horses. It may be a repetition of $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\upsilon$ in the line before, which has replaced some other verb. In a similar passage, Hipp. 1, 13, Xenophon proposed that restive horses should be rejected at the inspection: $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\mu\grave{\eta}$ $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ may well mean $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\beta\iota\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$. If however the infinitive could not = $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\chi\omega\rho\alpha\nu$, then $\pi\omega\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$ would be an easy remedy.

From Hesych. s. v. $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omega\nu$ $\tau\rho\omicron\chi\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\sigma\iota\nu$ $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\gamma\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\omega$ $\sigma\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omicron\nu$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$, Mr. Wyse is inclined to propose $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ for the corrupt $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$. Dr. Jackson proposes $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\pi\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$, and for $[\tau]\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\upsilon$, $[\sigma\tau]\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\upsilon$. **RDH.**

P. 122, l. 19. $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\mu\grave{\eta}$ $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $[\tau]\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\iota\nu$. If (as Mr. Hicks suggests) $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\upsilon$ has been erroneously repeated from the preceding line, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$ may be substituted. See (in addition to Xen. Hipp. 1, 13), Xen. Mem. 3, 3, 4, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\omicron\nu$ $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\sigma\omicron\iota$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omega\nu$ $\omicron\iota$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\delta\alpha\varsigma$ η $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\sigma\kappa\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ η $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$, $\omicron\iota$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\phi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\mu\grave{\eta}$ $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$, $\omicron\iota$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\acute{\omega}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\mu\grave{\eta}$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\eta\varsigma$. **W.**

P. 122, l. 22. $[\omicron\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ $\alpha]$ $\acute{\omicron}\tau\eta$ $\delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota\nu$. Read $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\omicron\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$. **AS.**

P. 122, l. 23. $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\tau\iota\nu\alpha$ $\pi[\rho\omicron]$ $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\eta\sigma\eta$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$ $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$. Read here and in the next line but one $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\eta\sigma\eta$. **JBM., LC.**

P. 122, l. 24. Restore $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omega\varsigma$ for $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\iota}\pi$

πους. **W.** The MSS. have ἀνίπτων, ἀνίππους, ἀνίππους in Xen. *Hell.* 7, 5, 23-25, where Keller reads ἀμίπτων, ἀμίππους, ἀμίππους. **N.**

P. 124, l. 7. συνοικεῖ. Read συνοδικεῖ, as at the beginning of ch. 47. **M., JBM., W.** 'So MS., corrected in corrigenda to ed. 2.'

K. P. 125, l. 1. ὅπως τῶν κοπρολόγων μηδεὶς ἐν τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ τείχους καταβαλεῖ κόπρον. (The MS. has ἐντὸς ἰδίων with dots above the final σ of ἐντὸς and the δ and σπ above the last three letters of ἰδίων.) Read ἐν τὸς παριών. **AS.** ἐντὸς τῆς περιόδου. **R.** The correction μηδεὶς ἐντὸς τοῦ Πελαργικοῦ τείχους is tempting: cf. p. 51, l. 10, *C. I. A.* iv. 1 Fasc. 2 n. 27 b, vs. 56 *agg.* and Herod. 5, 64, ἐν τῷ Πελαργικῷ τείχει. But perhaps ἐντὸς τοῦ τείχους gives sufficiently good sense. **W.** 'Over the last three letters of ἰδίων are written the characters σ π (apa). The latter character is rather doubtful and might be read as τα.' Accepting τα, I find in ἰδιῶν letter for letter ἰ σταδίον. 'within 10 stadia of the city wall.' **M.**

P. 125, l. 4. ὀχετοὺς μετεώρας εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν ἔκρουον ἐχομ[ένους]. Read μετεώρους and ἔχοντας. **B.** 'μετεώρους corrected in ed. 2.' **K.** Cf. Plato *Lysis* 761 B τὰς ἔκρους αὐτῶν (*sc.* τῶν ἐκ Διὸς ὑδάτων) εἰργοντας οἰκοδομήμασι τε καὶ ταφρεύμασιν. I restore the passage thus: ὀχετοὺς μετεώρας εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν ἔκρους ἔχοντας ποιεῖν. **W.**

P. 126, ll. 4, 7. πωλῆται...χρήσονται. Here twice over we have ἐπιμελεῖσθαι ὅπως followed by subjunctive. **W.** Read χρήσονται. **AS., R.**

P. 127, l. 11. καταπλέοντος εἰς τὸ σιτικὸν ἐμπόριον. Read Ἀττικόν as in Harpocration *s.v.* ἐπιμελὴς ἐμπόριον. Then καταπλέοντος acquires a meaning, for τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἐμπόριον was a recognized term for the Peiraëus, Demosth. pp. 917, 26, 918, 6, cf. 932, 13. **CT.** I suggest that the real reading is ἀστικόν. The term ἀστικὸν ἐμπόριον is explained in Bekker's *Anecdota*, p. 208, ὅπου οἱ ἀστοὶ ἐμπορεύονται, and similarly on pp. 284 and 456. **S.**

P. 127, l. 15. Read ἀπαξομένους. **R.**

P. 129, l. 6. Read ἰδίας for ἄλλας. **W.**

P. 130, l. 9. τοῖς τῆς φυλῆς τοῦ φεύγοντος δικάζουσιν. Read τῇ φυλῇ. **Cr.** 122, 12, 146, 8. Lysias 23, 2, has τοὺς τῇ ἵπποθωντῶν δικάζοντας, but the accusative is confirmed by the analogy of [Dem.] 47, 12, οἱ τὴν Οἰνίδα καὶ τὴν Ἐρεχθίδα διατιώντες. **W.** 'Possible' **K.**

P. 132, l. 9. εὖν τύχη ἀρχὴν ἄρχων [ἀλλή]ν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ. Read τῆς ἐν. **JB.** Possibly [ἀλλή]ν ἐν ἐκείνῳ κ.τ.λ. **W.**

P. 133, l. 11. οὔτοι (*i.e.* the λογισταί) γάρ

εἰσι μόνοι τοῖς ὑπευθύνους λογιζόμενοι. Insert οἱ after μόνοι. **JBM.**

P. 134, l. 6. γραμματέων ἐστὶ κύριος. Read γραμμάτων with Harpocration. **JB.**

P. 135, l. 3. Read ἀτελείαις, not πολιτείαις. **W.**

P. 136, l. 1. (οἱ ἱεροποιοί) τὰ τε [μαν]τευτὰ ἱερὰ θύουσιν κ.τ.λ. The *Lex. Seg.* (p. 265 of Bekker's *Anecdota*) has τὰ τε μαντεύματα ἱεροθυτοῦσι, and the *Lex. Demosth. Pal'm.* p. 11, has οἱ τὰ μεμαντευμένα ἱερὰ θύουσιν (not τὰ μαντεύματα ἱερὰ θύουσιν). **S.**

P. 137, l. 1. ἐπ[τα]τηρίς. Read ἐπτατηρίς. **M., JAS.** Not in L. and S. though it occurs also in Dionys. ap. Eus. h. e. vii 23 4. **M.**

P. 137, l. 3. (Of the festivals) καὶ τούτων οὐδεμία ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐγγί[νεται]. It is natural to conjecture ἔπει γίγνεται, though it does not seem easily reconcilable with the facts as stated in the notes. **JBM.**

P. 137, l. 4. ...δὲ πρόκειται...αἰς...ἐπὶ Κηφισοφώντος ἄρχοντος. Perhaps [ἄλλα] δὲ πρόκειται...αἰς [νεωστὶ] ἐπὶ Κηφισοφώντος ἄρχοντος? If the letter preceding αἰς were τ, and not φ or ρ, which Mr. Kenyon thinks it was, many words might be suggested to fill the gap. **N.**

P. 137, l. 11. Omit ἐννέα. **R.**

P. 139, l. 9 *sqq.* καὶ πρότερον μὲν εἰς ἐνέβαλλε τὴν [ψ]ῆφον, νῦν δ' ἀναγκὴ πάντας. ἐστὶ δὲ ψηφίζεσθαι περὶ αὐτῶν, ἵνα κ.τ.λ. A more satisfactory sense can be obtained by a change of punctuation. Remove the full stop after πάντας and replace δὲ ψηφίζεσθαι by διαψηφίζεσθαι. ('So probably MS.' **K.**) The latter part of the sentence will then run νῦν δ' ἀνάγκη πάντας ἐστὶ διαψηφίζεσθαι περὶ αὐτῶν. **W.**

P. 139, l. 13. δοκιμασθὲν δὲ...βαδίζουσιν. Read δοκιμασθέντες. **R., HE.**

P. 140, l. 8. A new paragraph should begin at καὶ ὁ μὲν ἄρχων. **R.**

P. 140, l. 14. Cf. Demosth. 39 § 7, p. 996, 21, πότερον σέ φέρουσιν ἢ μέ; The accusative seems absolutely required. Read τούτους here and on p. 141, l. 1. **W.**

P. 141, l. 2—
τὰς σκήψεις εἰσ[άγει] εἰς τις ἡ λε...η
π[ρὸς] ἕτερον ταύτην τὴν λητουργίαν].....
[ἐ]τέραν λητουργίαν καὶ τῶν χρόνων αὐτῷ...
εἰς μὴ ἐς...ἐτη μὴ γεγονέναι.

I had thought of λελύσθαι φῆ, but this does not give us a satisfactory construction.

The following is suggested as a provisional restoration:

τὰς σκήψεις εἰσάγει εἰς τις ἡ λε[λη]λυμένη φ[ῆ] πρότερον ταύτην τὴν λητουργίαν [ἢ λητουργεῖν] ἕτεραν λητουργίαν, καὶ τῶν χρόνων αὐτῷ ἐνεκα ἢ μὴ ἐξ[εῖναι] διὰ τὸ μ' ἐτη μὴ γεγονέναι. Cf. Dem. 50 § 9, τούτων ἐγὼ οὐδεμίαν

πρόφασιν ποιούμενος ὅτι τριηραρχῶ, καὶ οὐκ ἂν δυνάμην δύο λητορίας λητουργεῖν, οὐδὲ οἱ νόμοι δέσων. For the position of ἔνεκα, cf. Dem. *Lept.* 88; *Lysias*, 14 § 32; 20 § 30. **S.**

P. 141, l. 2. Perhaps we may partly fill up the lacuna—ἐὰν τις ἢ λειτουργεῖν μὴ 'θέλῃ] ἢ πρὸς ἕτερον ταύτην τὴν λειτουργίαν ἀπωθῆται καὶ αἰτήσῃ ἐτέραν. **R.**

P. 141, l. 8. ἀρχιέρειω[ν τὸν τ]ῷ. Read ἀρχιθεώρουσ τῷ, cf. *C.I.G.* 158a 33. **CT.** 'Possible' **K.**

P. 141, l. 9. For ἐπεμελείτο read ἐπιμελεῖται. **AS., R.** 'Possible' **K.**

P. 142, l. 2. <γο>νέων κακώσεως is certain. **W.** Bekker's *Anecdota*, p. 269, s.v. κακώσεως: ...ἡ τοιαύτη δίκη οὕτως ἀπεφέρετο γονέων κακώσεως, ὀρφανῶν κακώσεως ἢ οἶκον ὀρφανικοῦ κακώσεως. These three kinds of κάκωσις are all mentioned in the text in the same terms and in the same order. This is conclusive (if any argument is needed) in favour of Mr. Wyse's emendation, γονέων for νέων. **S.**

P. 142, l. 8. τὰ πατρώα or πατρώαν οὐσίαν would be a more satisfactory supplement. **W.**

P. 142, l. 8. Read αἰτιᾶται. **R.**

P. 142, l. 10. Mark a lacuna after κατάστασιν. **R.**

P. 142, l. 12. θέλωσιν. Read θέλουσιν. **AS.** (Corrected in ed. 2).

P. 142, l. 18. καὶ τῶν ἐπι[κλήρων]...α, I have thought of κ. τ. ἀποτιμώντων χωρία, but this involves the supposition that γένηται in l. 19 is wrong. In l. 20 the sense required is ἐὰν μὴ ἀποδώσιν. **W.**

P. 142, l. 19. Probably τιμητής. **W.**

P. 142, l. 20. Read διδώσι. **R.**

P. 142, last line.αὐμ...[δί]δωσι τοῖς παισὶν τὸν σῖτον οὕτως εἰσπράττει. Read καὶ οἱ ἐπίτροποι ἂν μὴ ἀποδώσι τοῖς παισὶν τὸν σῖτον οὕτως εἰσπράττει. **S.**

P. 143, l. 5. ἐχειροτόνει. Read χειροτονεῖ. **JBM., R.**

P. 143, l. 7. Διονυσίων τῶν ἐπὶ Ληναίων. Read Ληναίω. **M., B., AS.**

P. 143, l. 8. [ταύτην] μὲν οὖν πομπὴν κοινὴν πέμπουσιν...τὸν δὲ ἀγῶνα διατίθῃσιν ὁ βασιλεὺς. For ταύτην read τήν. **JBM.**

P. 143, l. 14. I see no reason to alter πρὸς τινα of MS. **W.**

P. 145, l. 5. δικάζουσιν...αἰ[ο]ι καὶ ἐπαίθριοι. Read σκοταῖοι. We learn from Lucian, *Hermotimus*, 64, that the Areopagites gave their sentences in the dark. **S.** In support of Dr. Sandys' conjecture, σκοταῖοι, see Lucian, *De Domo*, 18: ἀλλ' οὖν ἕκαστος ἐπειδὴν μόνον ὑπερβῇ τὸν οὐδὸν, ἀθρόω τῷ κάλλει περιχυθεὶς λόγων μὲν ἐκείνων ἢ ἀκροάσεως ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν αἰῶντι ἔοικεν, ὅλος δὲ πρὸς τοῖς

ὀρωμένοις ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ τίχοι τις παιτελῶς τυφλὸς ὢν ἢ ἐν νυκτὶ ὥσπερ ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλή ποιῶτο τὴν ἀκρόασιν. **M.** **JAS.** also refers to Luc. *De Dom.* 18. Read perhaps θυραῖοι. **HR.**

P. 145, ll. 9, 10. Correct οὐδ' εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἔξεστιν ἐμβάλλειν αὐτῷ. For the latter part of this corrupt passage it is necessary to compare [Dem.] 47 § 69, p. 1160, 19, ὀνομαστὶ μὲν μηδενὶ προαγορεύειν τοῖς δεδρακόσι δὲ καὶ κτεῖναισιν. That is, the blank in the indictment was filled by 'the perpetrators and slayers' (the participle are masculine). Cf. also Plato *Laws* 874 A B ἐὰν δὲ τεθνεὺς μὲν αὖ τις φανῇ καὶ μὴ ἀμελῶς ζητοῦσιν ἀνείρετος γίγνηται, τὰς μὲν προρρήσεις τὰς αὐτὰς γίγνεσθαι καθάπερ τοῖς ἄλλοις, προαγορεύειν δὲ τὸν φόνον τῷ δράσαντι καὶ ἐπιδικασάμενον ἐν ἀγορᾷ κηρύττει 'τῷ κτεῖναντι τὸν καὶ τὸν καὶ ὠφληκτόν φόνου μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν ἱερῶν.' I propose then ὅταν δέ τις μὴ εἰδῇ (or, as the letters are much rubbed, ἀγνοῇ) τὸν ποιήσαντα, τῷ δράσαντι λαγχάνει. The dative participle is of course masculine. **W.**

P. 146, l. 2. Read ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ. **R.**

P. 147, l. 2. Possibly we should read ἐπιχειροτονίας. **W.**

P. 147, l. 3. τὰς προβολὰς εἰσάγουσιν οὗτοι καὶ γραφὰς παρανόμων καὶ νόμον μὴ ἐπιτήδειον θείναι. Insert τοῦ before νόμον. **JBM.**

P. 147, l. 17. <κατα>κυροῦσι. **W.**

P. 148, l. 12. τὸ δ' ἔλαιον συλλέγεται. **RDH.**

P. 148, l. 15. πρότερον δ' ἐπώλει τὸν καρπὸν ἢ πόλιν. The reading ἐπώλει is confirmed by *Lys.* 7, 2 τοὺς ἐωνημένους τοὺς καρποὺς τῶν μοριῶν. For the supervision of the sacred olives by the Areopagus see the whole speech. A point of some interest to be noted is that the phrase 'formerly,' recurring so often in the second section of the work, may sometimes refer to the period after the year of Euclides, for *Lys.* 7, according to Blass (*Att. Ber.* i.² p. 591), is not earlier than 395 B.C. **W.**

P. 149, l. 13. ἀργύρια καὶ χρυσᾶ. Read ἀργυρᾶ. **R.**

P. 150, l. 6. τῆς φ[υ]λῆς. Read τῆς χηλῆς, cf. *Thuc.* viii. 90. 4. Thus the χηλή, the northern side of the Peiraeus, was under the same officer as the ἀκτῆ, the southern side. **CT.**

P. 152, l. 7. χειροτονοῦσι δὲ καὶ φυλάρχους, ἓνα τῆς φυλῆς. δέκα has dropt out after δὲ καὶ. **S.**

P. 155, l. 3 foll. τοῖς δὲ πρυτανεύουσιν εἰς σίτησιν*...[π]ροστίθεται δέκα προστίθενται.* Perhaps τοῖς δὲ πρυτανεύουσιν εἰς σίτησιν εἰς ὁβολὸς προστίθεται καὶ τοῖς δέκα δύο, i.e. an additional fee of one obol is paid

to the prytanes for maintenance, which in the case of the epistates and proedri is further raised to two obols. **R.** 'The MS. admits of εἰς ὀβολός.' **K.**

P. 156, l. 4. ἐκ[ατομβ]ειῶνα. Read ἑκατομβαῖωνα. **AS.** 'Possible.' **K.**

P. 162, ll. 2—12. ἐμπηγνύτης is an impossible word: the true reading must be ἐμπήκτης. **B.** ἐμπήκτης, proposed by Mr. Bywater, is confirmed by Bekker's *Anecdota*, p. 258, ἐμπήκτης: ὁ θεσμοθέτης. That the lexicographer had this passage in view is proved by the previous context where it is stated of the θεσμοθέτης that he ἐμπήγνυσι τὰ πινάκια. **S.**

P. 168, l. 14. Correct ὁ κήρυξ ἀγορεύει for ὁ κήρυξ ἀγοράζει. **W.** 'Possible.' **K.**

We have received further emendations too late for insertion from J. B. Bury, G. E. Marinidin, R. Y. Tyrrell, and W. G. Rutherford, which will appear in our next number.

ARISTOTLE, *Atheniensium Respublica*, 61.—There is a statement here that five of the ten Στρατηγοί at Athens had specific duties while the other five took the miscellaneous work; and that these specific duties were about Ὀπλίται, Χώρα, Μονυχία, Ἀκτὴ, Συμμορίαί. The treatise, as I have shown elsewhere,¹ was composed or revised between 328 and 325 B.C. This is the earliest notice of these specific duties; the Demosthenic decrees being spurious. The following notices come next in date. Deinarchos, in *Philoclem*, 2, mentions a Στρατηγός for Μονυχία in 325 B.C. The decree, *C.I.A.* ii. 809, a. 209, mentions a Στρατηγός for Συμμορίαί in 324 B.C. Plutarch, *Phocion*, 32, mentions a Στρατηγός for Χώρα in 317 B.C. The decree, *C.I.A.* ii. 331, mentions a Στρατηγός for Ναυτικόν before 315 B.C.—almost certainly in 317 B.C., cf. Diodoros, xviii. 72, 3—for

Παρασκευή in 296 B.C. and for Χώρα and Ξένοι and Ὀπλά subsequently.

Thus the statement was no longer true in 317 B.C., as there was then a Στρατηγός for Ναυτικόν. The decree in Plutarch, p. 852, authenticated by *C.I.A.* ii. 240, states that Lycurgos was χειροτονηθεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ πολέμου παρασκευῆς: and this suggests that there was a Στρατηγός for Παρασκευή before 325 B.C. But the decree does not actually style him Στρατηγός, and he probably was Ἐπιστάτης. There is ample evidence, *C.I.A.* ii. 403—405, 839, that the Στρατηγός for Παρασκευή was mainly occupied with public worship, not with warfare: and in *C.I.A.* ii. 733, B, 2, στρατ[ηγῶν τῶν ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ πολέμου παρασκευῆν] ἐν χειρ[οτονημένῳ], the restoration is entirely unwarranted.

As there are no notices of these specific duties before 328 B.C. at the earliest, though there are many afterwards, it seems highly probable that this division of duties was instituted about this date. There certainly was no Στρατηγός for Συμμορίαί five years before. An official inscription for the year 334, 333 B.C. contains the following note, *C.I.A.* ii. 804, A, b. 72—75, τοῦτῃ συντρίηραρχον οἱ Στρατηγοὶ καὶ οἱ Εἰκοσὶν κατέστησαν, where the Twenty are clearly representatives of the twenty Συμμορίαί. Thus the Στρατηγοὶ were then discharging collectively the proper duties of a Στρατηγός for Συμμορίαί.

The statement, then, must be limited to some few years between 333 and 317 B.C.

CECIL TORR.

C. 18, p. 48. ὁ λεγόμενος λόγος κ.τ.λ. Thucydides' informant seems to have confused the circumstances of the arrest of Aristogiton with the disarmament of the people by Pisistratus as narrated *supra* c. 15, p. 42.

C. 30, p. 84. Either the Hellenotamiae were not allowed to speak or move a resolution, or sat without voting, or those of them who acted as treasurers for the time being were precluded from sitting on the Council.

C. 35, p. 94. May not Archestratus have acted with Pericles rather than with Ephialtes? Compare c. 27.

C. 49, p. 122. The horses meant are not those of the ἵππεις (*infra* p. 123), but others kept by the State for military service.

ib. The ἄνιπτοι seem to be a different class from the πρόδρομοι. Was there at this time a sort of mounted infantry, composed of citizens who could ride, but were unable to maintain the position of ἵππεις? Compare the δυνάμει in Alexander's army (Smith's Dict. of Ant. art. *Excercitus*). P. 123 throws light on Lysias *pro Mantitheo* § 13 p. 147.

C. 54, p. 135. πολιτείας. Does not the word mean 'citizenships'? *i.e.* When any one was made an Athenian citizen, the name of the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν was appended to the record.

L. CAMPBELL.

p. 7, l. 2. We are here told that the residence of the Archon-Basileus was in the Βουκόλιον. This explains

¹ The reference is to the following note which appeared in the *Athenaeum* for Feb. 7.

c. 46 ποιεῖται (ἡ βουλὴ) καὶ πρὶς τριήρεις ἢ τετρήρεις, ὁποῦντες ἂν ὁ δῆμος χειροτονήσῃ. That certainly was written after the Athenians began to build quadriremes and before they began to build quinqueremes. The list of the fleet for the year 330, 329 B.C. mentions 18 quadriremes (*C.I.A.* ii. 807 b 67—79). The lists are missing for several years before. Probably the Athenians began to build quadriremes two or three years before; but the point is immaterial in determining the date of the treatise, as events of the year 329, 328 B.C. are mentioned in c. 54, ἐπὶ Κηφισοφάντος ἐρχοντος. The Athenians began to build quinqueremes in 325 B.C., for the list for the year 325, 324 B.C. mentions seven, while the list for the year 326, 325 B.C. mentions none (*C.I.A.* ii. 808 d 22—39; 809 d 62—92). Thus the treatise was composed (or revised) between 328 and 325 B.C.

the otherwise obscure passage quoted by Athenaeus, p. 235, from the law relating to the Archon-Basileus: τοὺς δὲ παρασίτους ἐκ τῆς βουκολίας ἐκλείπειν ἐκ τοῦ μέρους τοῦ ἐαυτῶν ἐκτέα κριθῶν κ.τ.λ. Hence we may correct the rendering of ἐκ τῆς (or ἐκτὸς) βουκολίας (*absque dolo*) in Telfy's *Corpus Iuris Attici*, § 358.

p. 38, l. 8. The story about Solon and Pisistratus is told in almost the same words in Aelian, *Var. Hist.* vi. l. 16.

p. 62, l. 1. ὡς ἐφάνη τὰ μέταλλα τὰ ἐν Μαρωνεία. Cp. Bekker's *Anecdota*, p. 279, Μαρώνεια: τόπος ἦν τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ὅπου τὰ μέταλλα εὐρέθη.

pp. 98, 99. The two boards of Ten mentioned in connexion with the Thirty tyrants are also distinguished from one another in the *Lex. Seg.* p. 235, 31 of Bekker's *Anecdota*, δέκα ἥσαν τινες ἐν Πειραιεὶ οἱ ἄρξαντες κατὰ τὴν τυραννίδα τῶν τριάκοντα ἀλλὰ καὶ προσέταζαν αὐτοῖς εὐθύναι τῆς ἀρχῆς δοῦναι. μὴ ἀγνοῶμεν δὲ ὅτι ἑτεροὶ εἰσὶ δέκα, οὓς Ἀθηναῖοι εἰλοντο μετὰ τὴν τῶν τριάκοντα κατάλυσιν.

p. 124 *init.* The paraphrase of the passage on the subject of the ἀδυνάτοι is to be found, not on p. 200, 3, but on p. 345, 18 of Bekker's *Anecdota*.

p. 126. The statement that the μετρονόμοι were ten in number, five for Athens and five for the Peiraieus, though not in accordance with Harpocration, is confirmed by the following article in Bekker's *Anecdota*, p. 278, s.v. ἀρχὴ τις Ἀθήνησι κληρωτὴ ἡ τῶν μετρονόμων, δέκα τὸν ἀριθμόν, ὧν πέντε μὲν ἥσαν ἐν τῇ Πειραιεὶ, πέντε δὲ ἐν Ἀστει. οὗτοι δὲ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν εἶχον, ὅπως δίκαια ᾗ τὰ μέτρα τῶν πωλούντων.

p. 135, ll. 6-8. The purport of this passage is given in nearly the same words in Bekker's *Anecdota*, p. 226, s.v. γραμματεὺς. καὶ τὸν γραμματέα ὁ δῆμος χειροτονεῖ, ἀναγνόμενον αὐτῷ καὶ τῇ βουλῇ. καὶ οὗτος οὐδεὶς τὸ σύνολον ἄλλον ἐστὶ κύριος ἢ τοῦ ἀναγμῶναι. J. E. SANDYS.

p. 3 l. 4 ἡ δὲ πᾶσα γῆ δι' ὀλίγων ἦν. cf. p. 13 l. 8 ἡ χώρα δι' ὀλίγων ἦν.

p. 2 l. 6 [δεδεμένοι τοῖς δανείσ]ασιν ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασι. The editor refers to c. 4 f. p. 13 l. 7, in which the passage is cited: ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς σώμασιν ἦσαν δεδεμένοι, καθάπερ εἰρηται. See also c. 6 pr. p. 15 κωλύσας [δανεί]ειν ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασιν, and c. 9 p. 26 l. 1.

p. 3 last line but one: τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς [Ἱ]στασαν ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλουτίνδην. cf. c. 3 f. p. 9 ἡ γὰρ αἵρεσις τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλουτίνδην ἦν. c. 1 p. 1 ὁμόσαντες ἀριστίνδην. Add to *lexx.* the law in *Dem.* p. 1069 7. *Plut. Sol.* 12 § 2. *Lysand.* 13 § 7 (where also πλουτίνδην, as in *vii sap. com.* 11 pr. p. 154). *Euseb. ecl. proph.* iv 4 p. 177 18. *CIA* I. 61. *App. b. c.* 135. *Ael. in Suid.* Διονυσίων σκυμμάτων *has pl.*

c. 3 p. 4 l. 1: δεκαερίαν. Add to *lexx.* *Epiphani.* *haer.* 16 l.

c. 3 p. 6 l. 11: διδὲ καὶ νεωστὶ γέγονεν ἡ ἀρχὴ μεγάλη τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις αὐξηθεῖσα. cf. c. 25 p. 69 f. *ἔπειτα τῆς βουλῆς... ἅπαντα περιεῖλε τὰ ἐπιθέτα.*

c. 5 p. 14 f. ἦν δ' ὁ Σόλων... τῇ οὐσίᾳ καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι τῶν μέσων. *Aristot. pol.* iv 11 p. 1296 a 18: σημειῶν δὲ δεῖ νομίζειν καὶ τὸ τοῖς βελτιστοῖς νομοθέτας εἶναι τῶν μέσων πολιτῶν. *Plut. Sol.* 1 § 2.

c. 6 p. 15 l. 3 from foot *χρεῶν ἀποκοπὰς*. cf. pp. 16 27 28 35. *Heraclid. Pontic.* in *Rose fragm.* *Aristot.* 2 611 3: νομοθετῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ χρεῶν ἀποκοπὰς ἐποίησε, τὴν εἰσαχθέναι λεγόμεν. *Diog. Laert.* I. 45. *Dem.* 17 § 15 p. 215 f. *Cic. Att.* vii 11 § 1. *Ast* on *Plat. legg.* (p. 160 of his ed.) 736 C.

c. 7 p. 17 l. 1 τοῖς δὲ Δράκοντος θεσμοῖς ἐπάσαντο χράμενοι πλὴν τῶν φονικῶν. cf. *Dem.* 23 § 66 p. 642 *Ael. v. h.* viii 10. *Ios. Ap.* I 4: τῶν δημοσίων γραμ-

μάτων ἀρχαιοτάτους τοὺς ὑπὸ Δράκοντος αὐτοῖς περὶ τῶν φονικῶν γραφέντας νόμους. *Paus.* vi 11 § 6.

c. 7 p. 17 l. 4 ὁμνύντες πρὸς τῷ λίθῳ. cf. c. 55 p. 139 l. 14. *Bergk* in *Rhein. Mus.* N. F. XIII 453 seq. *Liddell* and *Scott* s.v. λίθος.

c. 7 p. 17 l. 5 ἀναθήσειν ἀνδρίαντα χρυσοῦν. cf. c. 55 f. pp. 139 140.

c. 7 p. 19 l. 1: τὰς μὲν οὖν ἀρχὰς ἀπένειμεν ἄρχων ἐκ πεντακοσιμεθίωνων καὶ ἱππέων καὶ ζευγῶν. cf. *Aristot. pol.* ii 9 (12) p. 1274 a 15 *ἐπεὶ Σόλων... τὰς... ἀρχὰς ἐκ τῶν γνωρίμων καὶ τῶν εὐπόρων κατέστησε πάσας, ἐκ τῶν πεντακοσιμεθίωνων καὶ ζευγῶν καὶ... τῆς καλουμένης ἱππάδος*. *Poll.* viii. 129.

c. 7 p. 19 l. 6 τοῖς δὲ τὸ θητικὸν τελοῦσιν ἐκκλησίας καὶ δικαστηρίων μετέδωκε μόνον. cf. at the end of the chapter, p. 20 τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις θητικὸν οὐδεμιᾶς μετέχοντας ἀρχῆς. *Aristot. pol.* ii 9 (12) p. 1274 a 21 τὸ δὲ τέταρτον τὸ θητικόν, οἷς οὐδεμιᾶς ἀρχῆς μετῆν. The whole passage p. 19 l. 7—p. 20 l. 5 is in *Poll.* viii 129—131.

c. 8 f. p. 25 l. 7. The law against neutrality is found in *Cic. Att.* x 1 § 2, *Plut.* ii 550^b, 823^f, 965^d, *Diog. Laert.* i 58, *Cantacuzen.* iv 13. *Nicephorus Gregora* ix 6 fin.

c. 9 p. 25 26 δοκεῖ δὲ τῆς Σόλωνος πολιτείας τρία ταῦτ' εἶναι τὰ δημοτικώτατα, πρῶτον μὲν... τρίτον δὲ ([f]) μάλιστα φασιν ἰσχυρῆναι τὸ πλῆθος) ἡ εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον [ἐ]ρ[ε]σις]. κύριος γὰρ ὧν ὁ δῆμος τῆς ψήφου κύριος γίνεται τῆς πολιτείας. cf. *Aristot. pol.* ii 9 (12) 1273 b 35—1274 a 4 c.g. *ἵσκει δὲ Σόλων τὸν... δῆμον καταστήσαι, τὰ δικαστήρια ποιήσας ἐκ πάντων. διὰ καὶ μέμφομαι τινες αὐτῷ: λῦσαι γὰρ θάτερον, κύριον ποιήσαντα τὸ δικαστήριον πάντων, κληρωτῶν ὧν*. *Isocr. or.* 7 § 16 p. 143 *ἐκείνῃ τὴν δημοκρατίαν, ἣν Σόλων μὲν ὁ δημοτικώτατος γεγόμενος ἐνομοθέτησε*. *Dem. or.* 18 § 6 p. 227 Σόλων, εἵνους ἂν οὖν καὶ δημοτικός.

c. 9 p. 26 l. 7 περὶ τῶν κλήρων καὶ ἐπικλήρων. cf. c. 42 p. 109 f. περὶ κλήρων καὶ ἐπικλήρων. c. 56 p. 142 l. 4 ἐπικλήρων κακώσεως. 1. 12 κλήρων καὶ ἐπικλήρων ἐπὶ [δικασίαι]. 1. 13 and 18 τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπικλήρων. c. 59 f. p. 146 καὶ κλήρων καὶ ἐπικλήρων.

c. 10 pr. p. 27 τῶν τε μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν. *Böckh metrolog.* *Unters.* 277 seq. *Andocid. myst.* 83 *πολιτεῦσθαι Ἀθηναίους κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, νόμοις δὲ χρῆσθαι τοῖς Σόλωνος καὶ μέτροις καὶ σταθμοῖς*. *Mommsen röm. Münzwesen* 43 seq. *Hultsch gr. u. röm. Metrologie* 169 seq.

c. 10 f. p. 28 l. 1 ἐξήκοντα μῶνς τὸ τάλαντον ἀγοράσας. cf. c. 51 p. 127 l. 6 τὸν σταθμὸν ἔχοντας ὅσον ἂν οὗτοι τάξωσιν.

c. 11 f. p. 28: ἀμφοτέροις ἡναντιώθη, καὶ ἐξὲν αὐτῷ μεθ' ὁποτέρων ἡβουλετο συστάντι τυραννεῖν εἰλετο πρὸς ἀμφοτέροις ἀπεχθεσθῆναι σώσας τὴν πατρίδα καὶ τὰ βέλτιστα νομοθετήσας. Loosely cited by *Aristid.* II 360 *Dind.* (= II 278 2 seq. *Jobb* = III 460 *Canter*): ἀλλ' οὐχ ὅ γε δῆπου Σόλων ἐλάνθανεν αὐτὸν ὅσον τινὲς ἄξιος γένοιτο ἐπὶ τῶν προτέρων τῇ πόλει. οὐ γὰρ καὶ περὶ ἐκείνου γ' ἔμελλεν ἐρήσσεσθαι τίνα βελτίω τῶν δούλων ἢ τῶν ἐλευθέρων ἐποίησεν, οὐδ' ὡς ἄνευ τάξεως καὶ κοσμιότητος τὴν πόλιν φέρον καὶ φλυαριῶν ἐνέπηλθεν οὐδεὶς εἰδέν. ἀλλ' εἰ μὴ ἐκείνους αὐτοὺς νομίμους καὶ κοσμίους ἐκ τῶν δυνατῶν ἐποίησεν, ἄλλος γέ τις ἂν δόξειεν. ἐκείνους μέντοι παρὸν αὐτῷ στασιαζούσης τῆς πόλεως ὁποτέρων βουλοῖτο προστάτη τυραννεῖν, ἀπεχθεσθῆναι μᾶλλον ἀμφοτέροις εἰλετο ὑπὲρ τοῦ δικαίου καὶ τῶν μὲν πλουσιῶν ὅσον καλῶς εἶχεν ἀφείλε, τῷ δὲ δὴμῳ δ' οὐκ ἔβουλεν ὅσον ἐβούλετο... καὶ οὕτε φόβος τῶν ἰσχυροτέρων οὐτε τιμὴ παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν οὐδ' ἄλλο ταυτοῦτον οὐδὲν προηγάγετο αὐτὸν οὐδ' ἐξέστησεν οὐδ' ἐπῆρε παρὰ βέλτιστα ἡγεῖτο πράξαι τι.

c. 13 p. 36 Πεισιστράτος δημοτικώτατος εἶναι δοκᾷν. The words recur c. 13 pr. p. 37.

c. 14 p. 39 l. 6 Πεισιστράτος (so, *Πισ.*, ms.) δέ...

διφέρει τὰ κοινὰ πολιτικῶς μᾶλλον ἢ τυραννικῶς. Repeated with a reference to this place, c. 16 pr. p. 43. πολιτικῶς may be compared with Lat. *civiler*.

c. 14 p. 40 l. 3 ἀρχαίως καὶ λίαν ἀπλῶς. Hence Plut. Sol. 3 § 5 ἐν δὲ τοῖς φυσικοῖς ἀπλοῦς ἐστὶ λίαν καὶ ἀρχαίως.

c. 14 f. p. 41 παραβατούσης is so written in ms. c. 14 and 15: cf. Aristot. pol. viii (v) 9 (12) p. 1315 b 30 δις γὰρ ἔφυγε Πεισίστρατος τυραννῶν. c. 15 p. 42 l. 5 τὴν ἐπὶ Παλληνίδι μάχην cf. c. 17 f. p. 46.

c. 16 p. 44 l. 4 up. With the whole passage (καὶ ποτε προσκληθεὶς φόνον δίκην εἰς Ἄρειον πάγον αὐτὸς μὲν ἀπήντησεν ὡς ἀπολογησόμενος, ὁ δὲ προσκαλεσόμενος προβήσθαι ἔλιπε) cf. Aristot. pol. viii (v) 9 (12) p. 1365 b 21: φασὶ δὲ καὶ Πεισίστρατον ὑπομίνειν ποτε προσκληθέντα δίκην εἰς Ἄρειον πάγον.

c. 17 pr. p. 45: Πισίστρατος (sic) μὲν οὐν...ἀπέθανε...ἀφ' οὗ μὲν κατέστη τὸ πρῶτον τυράννος ἐπὶ τριάκοντα καὶ τρία βιώσας, ἃ δ' ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ διέμεινεν ἐνδὸς δέοντα εἰκοσι, ἔφυγεν γὰρ τὰ λοιπὰ. cf. Aristot. pol. viii (v) 9 (12) p. 1315 b 29 τρίτῃ δ' [ἐγγύθεν τυραννίς] ἢ τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν Ἀθήνησιν. οὐκ ἐγένετο δὲ συνεχής: δις γὰρ ἔφυγε Πεισίστρατος τυραννῶν ὥστ' ἐν ἑτασι τριάκοντα καὶ τρισὶν ἑπτακαίδεκα ἐπὶ τούτων ἐτυράνευσεν, ὀκτωκαίδεκα δὲ οἱ παῖδες, ὥστε τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τριάκοντα καὶ πέντε. Our treatise (c. 19 f. pp. 51 52) gives 17 years for the sons' reign, and a total of 49 years for the whole tyranny, which includes the years of exile. Justin, ii 8 § 10: occupata tyrannide per annos xxxiii regnavit.

c. 23 f. p. 66 τοὺς ὅρκους ὥμοσεν τοῖς ἰωσι ὥστε τὸν αὐτὸν ἐχθρὸν εἶναι καὶ φίλον ἐφ' οἷς καὶ τοὺς μύθους ἐν τῷ πελάγει καθέσται. cf. Plut. Aristid. 25 § 1. An interesting parallel to Herodot. i 165 (where see Bähr) and Hor. epod. 16 25.

c. 24 p. 68 l. 5: ἀρχαὶ δ' ἐνδημοὶ μὲν εἰς ἑπτακοσίους ἄνδρας, ὑπερήριοι δ' εἰς ἑπτακοσίους. cf. the law in Aeschin. c. Timarch. 21 § 47 p. 3 f. μηδὲ ἀρχὴν ἀρχέτω μηδεμίαν, μήτε ἐνδημον μήτε ὑπερήριον.

c. 25 p. 69 l. 3 ἢ πολιτεία...ὑποφερομένη. cf. c. 36 pr. p. 95 οὕτως δὲ τῆς πόλεως ὑποφερομένης.

c. 25 p. 72 l. 4 κατηγοροῦν τὴν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν 5 π' Ἐφιάλτης καὶ Θεμιστοκλῆς...ἔως περιέλιοντο αὐτῶν τὴν δύναμιν. Aristot. pol. ii 9 3 p. 1274a 7 καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴν Ἐφιάλτης ἐκόλουσε καὶ Περικλῆς. Philochorus (vii fr. 141b in Müller fragm. hist. Gr. I 407 from lex. rhet. ad calc. Phot. p. 674 Dobree) 8 τε Ἐφιάλτης μόνα κατέλειπε τῇ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῇ τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος. Plut. Pericl. 9 § 4. Paus. i 29 15 Ἐφιάλτης δὲ τὰ νόμιμα τὰ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ μάλιστα ἐλυμήνατο. Plut. Cimon 15 § 1. praec. ger. rei p. c. 15 § 18 p. 182 ὡς Περικλῆς...δὲ Ἐφιάλτου...τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴν ἐταπεινώσει.

c. 25 f. p. 72 ὁ Ἐφιάλτης δολοφονηθεὶς. Diod. xi 77 6: τῆς νυκτὸς ἀναιρεθεὶς ἀθροὺν ἔσχε τὴν τοῦ βίου τελευτήν. [Plat.] Axioch. 368d: ποῦ δ' Ἐφιάλτης [τέθηκε];

c. 26 p. 78 Κλεοφῶν δὲ Λυρσοπίδης. So styled by Andoc. myst. § 146 p. 19. Aesch. fals. leg. § 76 p. 38. schol. Aristoph. Thesm. 805. ran. 681 (restored by Taylor). cf. Suid. s. v. φιλοτιμότησειν Κλεοφῶντος. Ael. v. h. xii 43 says that his father's name was unknown.

c. 27 p. 75 l. 12: ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ μισθοφορὰ τὰ δικαστήρια Περικλῆς πρῶτος, ἀντιδιμαγωγῶν πρὸς τὴν κίλμινος εὐπορίαν. Plat. Gorg. 515^e: ταυτὶ γὰρ ἔγωγε ἀκούω, Περικλέα πεποιτημένον Ἀθηναίους ἀργούσι καὶ δαίκοις καὶ λάλοις καὶ φιλαργύροις, εἰς μισθοφορίαν πρῶτον καταστήσαντα. Plut. Pericl. 9 § 3.

c. 29 p. 81 l. 1 συμπεσιθέντων τῶν πολλῶν διὰ τὸ νομίσαι βασιλείαν...ἐαυτοὺς συμπολεμήσειν ἐὰν δὲ ὀλίγων ποιήσονται τὴν πολιτείαν. Aristot. pol. viii (v) 3 8

p. 1304 l. 10 ὅτε μὲν γὰρ ἐξαπατήσαντες τὸ πρῶτον ἐκόντων μεταβάλλουσι τὴν πολιτείαν, εἰδ' ὕστερον βίᾳ κατέχουσιν ἄκόντων, ὅλον ἐπὶ τῶν τετρακοσίων τὸν δῆμον ἐξαπάτησαν φάσκοντες τὸν βασιλεῖα χρήματα παρέχειν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον τὸν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους, ψευδόμενοι δὲ κατέχειν ἐπειρώντο τὴν πολιτείαν.

ibid. l. 4 τὸν δῆμον ἐλάσθαι μετὰ τῶν προὑπαρχόντων δέκα προβούλων ἑλλοὺς εἰκοσι ἐκ τῶν ὑπὲρ τεττάρων ἐπὶ γεγενησάντων, ὅτινες ὁμῶσαντες ἢ μὴν συγγράψαι ἢ ἂν ἡγῶνται βέλτισται εἶναι τῇ πόλει συγγράφουσι περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας. Aristot. rhet. iii 18 6 p. 1419a 26 ὅσον Σοφοκλῆς ἐρωτώμενος ὑπὸ Πεισάνδρου εἰ ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ ὥσπερ καὶ τοῖς ἑλλοὺς προβούλοις, καταστήσαι τοὺς τετρακοσίους ἔφη: τί δὲ; οὐ πονηρὰ σοὶ ταῦτα ἰδοῦμαι εἶναι; ἔφη. οὐκοῦν σὺ ταῦτα ἔπραξας τὰ πονηρὰ; ναὶ ἔφη. οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἄλλα βελτίον. Isocr. Areop. § 58 p. 151. Lys. 12 § 65 p. 126.

c. 30 p. 85 l. 11 τὰς δ' ἔδρας ποιεῖν τῆς βουλῆς. cf. c. 4 p. 12 l. 4: ὅταν ἔδρα βουλῆς ἢ ἐκκλησίας ᾖ. It is the technical term. CIA I 31 l. 7. 59 l. 41. II 800b 15 cet.

c. 32 pp. 88 89 Pisander, Antiphon and Thera- menes found together also in Lys. adv. Eratosth. § 65. c. 34 p. 91 l. 5 συνναυμαχίσσαντας. Hellanic. fr. 80 (Müller fr. hist. Gr. I 56) in schol. Aristoph. ran. 694. [Plat.] Axioch. 368d states that all ten στρατηγοὶ were condemned to death.

c. 37 p. 97 l. 2 νόμους εἰσένεγκαν εἰς τὴν βουλὴν δύο κελεύοντες ἐπιχειροταίνειν, ὧν ὁ μὲν εἰς αὐτοκράτορας ἐποίησε τοὺς τριάκοντα τῶν πολιτῶν ἀποκτείνειν τοὺς μὴ ἐκ τοῦ καταλόγου μετέχοντας τῶν τρισχιλίων. cf. Isocr. Callim. § 16 p. 374d νῦν δὲ οὐδὲν φανήσεται τῶν πολιτῶν ὅτι χρήμασι ζημιώσας ὅτι περὶ τοῦ σώματος εἰς κίνδυνον καταστήσας, οὐτ' ἐκ μὲν τῶν μετεχόντων τῆς πολιτείας ἐξελέφας εἰς δὲ τὸν μετὰ Λυσάνδρου κατάλογον ἐγγράψας.

c. 39 p. 101 l. 6 up: τῶν δὲ παρεληλυθότων μηδενὶ πρὸς μηδὲνα μνησικακεῖν ἐξείναι πλην πρὸς τοὺς τριάκοντα καὶ τοὺς δέκα καὶ τοὺς ἑνδεκα καὶ τῶν τοῦ Πειραιεύς ἄρχοντας, μηδὲ πρὸς τοούτους ἐὰν δίδωσιν εὐθύναι. Cf. c. 40 p. 103 l. 6 and 13. Xen. Hell. ii 4 43: καὶ ὁμῶσαντες ὅρκους ἢ μὴν μὴ μνησικακῆσειν, ἔτι καὶ νῦν ὁμοῦ τε πολιτεύοντα, καὶ τοῖς ὅρκοις ἐμμένει ὁ δῆμος. Andocid. myst. § 81 ἔδοξε μὴ μνησικακῆσειν ἀλλήλους τῶν γεγενημένων. § 90 φέρε δὴ τοῖνυν, οἱ ὅρκοι ὅμιν πῶς ἔχουσιν; ὁ μὲν κοινὸς τῇ πόλει ἀπάσθ, ὃν ὁμωκόκατε πάντες μετὰ τὰς διαλλαγὰς, 'καὶ οὐ μνησικακῆσω τῶν πολιτῶν οὐδενὶ πλην τῶν τριάκοντα καὶ τῶν ἑνδεκα' οὐδὲ τούτων δὲ ἐν ἐβέλῃ εὐθύναι δίδονται τῆς ἀρχῆς ἢς ἤρξεν.' ὅπου τοῖνυν αὐτοῖς τοῖς τριάκοντα ὤμνυτε μὴ μνησικακῆσειν τοῖς μεγίστων κακῶν αἰτίαις, εἰ δίδοιεν εὐθύναις, ἢ που σχολῇ τῶν γε ἄλλων πολιτῶν τινὶ ἡξιοῦτε μνησικακεῖν. cf. § 91. Justin v 10 § 11. comm. on Aristoph. Plut. 1146.

c. 42 p. 107 l. 6 μετέχουσιν μὲν τῆς πολιτείας οἱ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων γεγενησάντων. cf. c. 26 f. p. 74 ἔργονα μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως δὲ ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀστυῖν ἢ γεγενησάντων. cf. Aristot. pol. iii 1 9 p. 1275b 21 ὀρίζονται δὲ πρὸς τὴν χρῆσιν πολιτῶν τὸν ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων πολιτῶν καὶ μὴ ὑθατέρου μόνον. Plut. Pericl. 37 § 3 μόνους Ἀθηναίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐκ δευτέρων Ἀθηναίων γεγενησάντας. Ael. v. h. vi 10 Περικλῆς στρατηγῶν Ἀθηναίους νόμον ἔγραψεν, ἐὰν μὴ τύχη τις ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ὑπάρχων ἀστών, τούτῳ μὴ μετεῖναι τῆς πολιτείας. xiii 24. Suid. s. v. δημοποίητος. Diog. Laert. ii 31. cf. Aristot. pol. iii 5 (3) 5 p. 1278a 34: τέλος δὲ μόνον τοὺς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀστών πολιτίτας ποιοῦσιν. Philippi Beiträge zur Gesch. d. att. Bürgerrechts p. 69 seq. Isaeus or. 8 19 p. 71. Dem. or. 57 54 p. 1315. 59 92 p. 1376.

c. 42 p. 108 f. καταπέλτην ἀφιέναι διδάσκουσι. cf. Eth. N. iii 2 p. 1111a 8 δὲ πράττει ἀγνοήσας ἐν τῷ, ὅλον...δείξει βουλούμενος ἀφεῖναι, ὡς ὁ τὸν καταπέλτην.

c. 42 p. 109 l. 7 ἐκκλησίας ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ γινομένης. Iuv. x 128 n. Plat. Timol. 34 § 3. 38 § 3 bis. Nep. Timol. 4 § 2. Athenian decree in Ioseph. ant. xiv 85. The inscriptions bearing on the point are collected by Adam Reusch de diebus contionum ordinar. ap. Athenienses (diss. phil. Argentor. sel. III 4).

c. 43 p. 111 l. 2 κατὰ σελήνην γὰρ ἄγουσι τὸν ἐνιαυτόν. Aristoph. nub. 626 κατὰ σελήνην ὡς ἄγειν χρὴ τοῦ βίου τὰς ἡμέρας. Diog. i 59 (of Solon) ἤξειώτε 'Αθηναίους τὰς ἡμέρας κατὰ σελήνην ἄγειν.

c. 44 p. 116 l. 2 τῆς τ' εὐκοσμίας ἐπιμελοῦνται. Aristot. pol. vi (iv) 15 p. 1299b 16 and 19. vii (vi) 8 p. 1321b 4 and 20. Isocr. Areop. § 37 p. 147 ὥστε τὴν ἐξ 'Αρείου πάγου βουλήν ἐπέστησαν ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῆς εὐκοσμίας. CIG III 1083. Chrys. XI 471^c. c. 45 pr. p. 117 τὸν δῆμον. Euseb. mart. Pal. 13 § 6 f.

c. 48 p. 121 l. 3 ἐπιστυλίων. CIG I 4608.

c. 49 p. 124 l. 7 συνοικεῖ δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἑρχαῖς τὰ πλείστ', ὡς ἔπος εἰπείν. I conjectured συνοικεῖ before I observed that the author, as his manner is, repeats himself. See c. 47, pr. p. 119 συνοικεῖ δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἑρχαῖς τὰ πλείστα. cf. 57 p. 143 l. 4 up: ὡς δ' ἔπος εἰπείν καὶ τὰς πατρίους θυσίας διοικεῖ οὗτος πάσας.

c. 51 p. 127 l. 4 ὅπως οἱ τε μολωθροὶ πρὸς τὰς τιμὰς τῶν κριθῶν τὰ ἄλφita πωλήσουσι καὶ οἱ ἄρτοποιοι πρὸς τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πυρῶν τοὺς ἄρτους. cf. Theophr. h. pl. viii 8 2: 'Αθήνησι γούν αἱ κριθαὶ τὰ πλείστα ποιούσιν ἄλφita, κριθοφόρος γὰρ ἄριστη. For μολωθρὸς see H. Blümner Terminologie und Technologie der Gewerbe und Künste I. (Leipz. 1875) 38 5.

P. 52, l. 1. τὰ δὲ σύμπαντα σὺν οἷς κ.τ.λ. I note the idiomatic use of the preposition σὺν, as in the Orators and upon inscriptions, in an enumeration.

c. 55 f. pp. 139 140 ὁμνέουσιν...δῶρα μὴ λήψεσθαι τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐνεκα, κἄν τι λάβωσιν ἀνδράντα ἀναθήσειν χρυσόν. cf. Ast and Stallbaum on Plat. Phaedr. 235^{de}. Pollux VIII 85 Suid. χρυσὴ εἰκὼν. Zonaras Χρύσειος ἀνδρείδης (sic).

c. 57 p. 144 l. 7 καὶ φάρμακον ἐὰν ἀποκτείνῃ δοῦς καὶ πυρκαϊῆς. Demosth. or. 23 § 24 p. 628 γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν μὲν τῷ νόμῳ τὴν βουλήν δικάζειν φόνου καὶ τραύματος ἐκ προνοίας καὶ πυρκαϊῆς καὶ φαρμάκων, ἐὰν τις ἀποκτείνῃ δοῦς.

ib. l. 8 τῶν δ' ἀκουσίων καὶ βουλευέσεως κἄν οἰκέτην ἀποκτείνῃ τις ἢ μέτοικον ἢ ξένον. cf. schol. Aeschin. f. l. § 87 δικάζον δ' ἀκουσίον φόνου καὶ βουλευέσεως καὶ οἰκέτην ἢ μέτοικον ἢ ξένον ἀποκτείναντι. law in Dem. or. 23 § 53 p. 637 ἐὰν τις ἀποκτείνῃ ἐν ἄλλοις ἄκων ἢ ἐν ὁδῷ καθελὼν ἢ ἐν πολέμῳ ἀγνοήσας, ἢ ἐπὶ τούτων ἐνεκα μὴ φεύγειν κτείναντα.

c. 57 p. 145 l. 1 τούτῳ δ' ἐν φρεαττοῖ δικάζουσι. Dem. or. 231 § 77, 78 pp. 645-6. Aristot. pol. vi (iv) 16 (13) 2 p. 1300b 27 τέταρτον δὲ [δικαστήριον] ὅσα τοῖς φεύγουσιν ἐπὶ καθόδῳ ἐπιφέρεται φόνου, οἷον 'Αθήνησι λέγεται καὶ τὸ ἐν φρεαττοῖ δικαστήριον. Bursian Geogr. Griech. I 270. Bekker anec. 311 17. Poll. viii 120. Paus. i 23 § 11.

c. 62 p. 155 l. 2 εἴθ' ἢ βουλὴ πέντε ὀβολούς. cf. Thuc. viii 69 f.

c. 31 p. 162 line 13 ἐκ τῆς ὁδρίας. For ὁδρία = κάδος = urna see Rh. Mus. 26 72. Xen. Hell. i 7 9 διαψηφισσάσαι 'Αθηναίους πάντας κατὰ φυλάς: θεῖναι δὲ εἰς τὴν φυλὴν ἐκάστην δύο ὁδρίας: ἐφ' ἐκάστη δὲ τῇ

φυλῇ κήρυκα κηρύττειν, ὅτ' δοκοῦσιν ἀδικεῖν οἱ στρατηγοὶ οὐκ ἀνελόμενοι τοὺς νικήσαντας ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ, εἰς τὴν προτέραν ψηφισσάσαι, ὅτ' δὲ μή, εἰς τὴν ὑστέραν.

col. 37 l. 4 ἐν τῷ μέρει. See Blomfield Agam. 335. Thuc. iv 11 3. viii 16 3.

With several passages of the 'Aθ. πολ. may be compared Rud. Schoell, de extraordinariis quibusdam magistratibus Atheniensium (in the comm. phil. in honorem Th. Mommseni Berol. 1877) 451-470.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

The passage of Polybius referred to by Mr. Kenyon (Introd., p. xvii.) as citing a direct mention by Timaeus of the Πολιτεῖαι of Aristotle does not appear to contain any such direct mention. It tells us that Aristotle wrote about the Locrian state, and was criticised by Timaeus: it does not tell us in what work he did so. As no other early authority for Aristotle's Πολιτεῖαι is quoted, it is important that this piece of evidence should be accurately stated.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

P. 107, l. 1. πρῶτον μὲν 'Αγύρριος ὀβολὸν ἐπόρριον, μετὰ δὲ τούτων 'Ηρακλείδης ὁ Κλαζομένιος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπικαλούμενος διώβολον, πάλιν δ' 'Αγύρριος τριώβολον. In the *Ion* attributed to Plato, 541 C., Heraclides of Clazomenae is mentioned, together with Apollodorus of Cyzicus and Phanosthenes of Andros, as a foreigner who had held the office of *στρατηγός* and other offices at Athens.

H. JACKSON.

P. 62. Note on τάλαντα ἑκατόν.

I cannot admit that Polyaeus (i. 30, 5) 'evidently took this story from Aristotle.' Polyaeus gives details not in the text, e.g. ἐν τῷ πρὸς Αἰγινήτας πολέμῳ ἀλλ' *ad fin.* οὐ μόνον κατὰ Αἰγινήτων ταῖς τριήρεσι ταύταις ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ Περώων ἐχρήσαντο. If it be suggested that Polyaeus 'contaminated' Herodotus (7, 144) and 'Aristotle,' I reply that he differs from Herodotus as to the use made of the ships: for Herodotus expressly states that they were not used for the war against Aegina. Is it not possible that the narrative of Polyaeus is derived ultimately from the same source as the story in the text? 'Aristotle's' version reads like an abbreviated excerpt: how obscure, for example, is the bearing of the observation οὐ λέγων ὅτι χρήσεται τοῖς χρήμασι!

P. 120, l. 3. τὰ πρᾶντα μέταλλα [ἄσα] ἐργάσιμα τὰ εἰς τρία ἔτη πεπραμένα καὶ τὰ συγκεχωρημένα τὰ... πεπραμένα. It may be worth while to examine carefully the MS. here. The inscriptions containing records of purchases of mines (*C.I.A.* ii. 780-783) distinguishes between ἀνασάξιμα and καινοτομαίαι. See Harp. s. v. ἀποσάξαντα; Bekk. *An. Gr.* p. 205, l. 10; Hyper. *Euw.* col. xlv.

Is it merely an accident that the period of three years is mentioned in Hyper. *Euw.* col. xlv. and in the opening words of the speech πρὸς Μήκυθον attributed to Dinarchus, *Fr. Or. Att.* (Sauppe) p. 325, l. 2 *sqq.*?

W. WYSE.

UN-ARISTOTELIAN WORDS AND PHRASES CONTAINED IN THE 'ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

There seems to be little room for doubt as to the age of this treatise, but a good deal as to the authorship. The impression produced on my own mind by the general tone of thought and language is certainly against its being by Aristotle; but it is desirable to

get something more tangible than impressions, and as a contribution to this question I have jotted down some words and phrases which seem to point to another than Aristotle as the author.

In the first place we have, according to the printed

text, the following entirely new words, for the list of which I am indebted to Prof. J. E. B. Mayor.

Of new words Dr. Sandys has expunged two, *δεκαρχαιρεσία* p. 116 and *διαφημισμός* p. 36, and Mr. Bywater one, *ἐμπηγνυτής* 162 bis. Remain *διαφραδὴν* 32 (Solon). *ἐπεισκαλέω* and *ἐπείσκλητος* 85. *ἐπισχιδίσις* 117. *ἐπταετηρίς* 137. *ἐπτάχους* 166. *προδιασπείρω* 40. *προδρομεύω* 122. *προεδρικὸς* 147. *προσαναζητέω* 81. *προσπαταγίνομαι* 159. *τριάκον-τόριον* 141. In all 12.

In the next place there are others which are only to be found in our text and in quotations from it, such as

διερρηγμένον (*ἐπιθήμα*) 163 'a perforated lid.' Others are not found elsewhere in any contemporary writer. Such are

καταφατίζω, 17, only found besides in Plut. *Sol. ζευγίστιον*, 20, found in Pollux. *ἐπιδιανέμω*, 28, first in Josephus, and that in a different sense.

μεμψιμορία, 32, in Lucian and Pseudo-Arist. *Virt. et Vit.* 7. 6.

προδανείζω, 43, Dio Cass. Plut.

ἐξαπορέω, 65, Polybius.

προδανείζω, 43, Dio Cass. Lucian.

συναρτίσκεισθαι τοῖς γενομένοις, 90, Sext. Emp.

μανιάω, 95, Josephus.

δαστρακοφρία, 112, Plutarch.

εὐσημία, 117, only used by Hippocrates, and that in a technical sense.

ἐπιστόλιον, 120, Plutarch.

ἐκθύμα, 125, 'sin-offering.' Only found elsewhere in Hippocrates, meaning 'pustule.'

ἐπιθετον, 6, 'an appendage,' not found elsewhere in this sense.

παραστρατηγηθῆναι διὰ τῶν φίλων, 16, Dion. H. and Plutarch in a different sense.

I give next examples of unusual phrases or constructions; for those marked with × some sort of parallel may be found in Aristotle, but not, I think, for the others.

× P. 3, l. 4. *ἡ γῆ δι' ὀλίγων ἦν* 'the land was in few hands,' also p. 13, l. 18. This is not quite the same as p. 82, l. 2 *δι' ὀλίγων ποιῆσθαι τὴν πολιτείαν*, and *Pol.* iii. 13 *ἡ πολιτεία δι' ὀλίγων ἐστίν*.

P. 3, l. 6. *δεδεμένοι (with dat.) τοῖς δανείσασιν ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασι*.

P. 27. *ἀναπληροῦσθαι ταῖς ἐκατὸν (δραχμαῖς) α* somewhat poetical phrase for *ἀν. εἰς τὰς ἐκατὸν*.

P. 36, l. 4. *ζητεῖν τὴν ὀλιγαρχίαν*, cf. 93, 6.

P. 36, l. 7. *προσεκεκόσμητο τοῖς τοῖς*, apparently 'were arrayed on the same side with them.' Elsewhere only found in sense 'to adorn further,' Plut. II. 316 B.

P. 39, l. 2. *ἐξαράμενος τὰ ὕπλα πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν*. I can find no parallel to this.

P. 48, l. 10. *[τῇ] φύσει τῶν ἐπιφανῶν καὶ φίλοι*

τοῖς τυράννοις ἦσαν, 'were by their birth of the illustrious class.'

P. 65, p. 4. *οὐδενὶ δόγματι λαβοῦσα τὴν ἡγεμονίαν*, 'the Areopagus having obtained the supremacy without any decree.'

P. 90, l. 16. *ἐκ τῶν ὕπων τῆς πολιτείας οὐσης* and l. 8 *τὰ πράγματα παρέδωκαν τοῖς πεντακισχίλοις τοῖς ἐκ τῶν ὕπων*.

P. 92, l. 6. *ἠτύχησαν τὴν ναυμαχίαν*, 'were defeated.'

P. 93, last line. *προσελόμενοι σφισὶν αὐτοῖς ἄρχοντας*. Not uncommon in Herod. and Xenoph., never in Aristotle.

P. 99, l. 11. *ἔνιοι τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱππέσιν*, used, I suppose, instead of *τῶν ἱππέων* to show that the class of *equites* is intended. Is there any parallel?

P. 100, l. 4. *ἐπὶ πέρας ἡγάγε τὴν εἰρήνην*, 'concluded the peace.' Any example?

P. 103, last line. *οὐχ οἶον—ἀλλὰ καὶ*, not found before Polybius, and condemned as un-Attic by Phrynichus.

P. 106. *μεχρὶ τῆς νῦν*. What is the first instance of this use? Aristotle seems always to use the phrase *τὸ νῦν*, not *ἡ νῦν*.

P. 106, l. 7. *προσεπιλαμβάνουσα τῷ πλήθει τὴν ἐξουσίαν*. Any example?

× P. 106, l. 14. *εὐδιαφορώτεροι ὀλίγοι τῶν πολλῶν*, used in a different sense *Pol.* v. 6. 10 *ὀλιγαρχία οὐκ εὐδιαφορος ἐξ αὐτῆς*.

× P. 108, l. 1. *γεγονέναι τὴν ἡλικίαν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου*.

P. 109. *συμμίγνυσθαι πράγμασι*, 'to be mixed up in affairs.'

P. 111, l. 7. *τὴν βουλὴν (συνάγουσιν) ὅσαι ἡμέραι*, cf. *ὅσα ἔτη Xen. Ath.* III. 4, *ὅσοι μῆνες Dem.* 744. 25.

P. 111, l. 7. *ἐάν τις ἡμέρα ἀφέσιμος ᾖ*, 'a holiday,' not found before Aristides.

**Ὅς ἐάν* is found for *ὅς ἂν* in pp. 84, 87, 140; *ὅσαπερ ἐάν* in p. 157. This is rejected in the standard texts of classical authors, though not unfrequently occurring in the MSS.

It may be argued, if these late words are inconsistent with the Aristotelian authorship, are they not equally inconsistent with the date which seems to be ascertained on independent grounds? But though we may say positively of a very voluminous author, that the absence of a common phrase such as *οὐχ οἶον* in his known writings affords a presumption against the probability of a treatise, in which it occurs, being written by him; we cannot speak with the same confidence of all contemporary writers. And the time of Alexander was just one for the production of a plentiful crop of neologisms.

It would be interesting if some one would look into the negative evidence arising from the absence of well-known Aristotelianisms in our treatise. I have not made special search but I do not think I have come across a single *κλῆν* εἰ. J. B. MAYOR.

SOME NOTES ON THE NEW ANTIOPE FRAGMENTS.

In vol. xvii. of *Hermathena* (Feb. 1891) a short description is given by Prof. Mahaffy of the new fragments of the *Antiope*, as well as of some of the documents found together with them and which help to date them. The following is a summary of Prof. Mahaffy's paper:

These new papyrus fragments were recovered by Mr. Flinders Petrie in the structure of certain Ptolemaic mummy cases which he exhumed at Gurob in the Fayoum: a fuller account with facsimiles is to be published in the forthcoming *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*.

Some of the papers found with the *Antiope* are dated in the early years of Ptolemy iii., that is to say, before A.C. 230, and no date later than this has been obtained throughout; it is therefore improbable that the *Antiope* is more recent; on the contrary, we may infer that a play of Euripides would take longer than mere accounts, letters, &c., to become waste paper; besides which, the palaeography of the hand is very old, probably generations older than this date; the *Antiope* is therefore the oldest known MS. of a Greek play.

The main reasons for its identification are as follows: the argument of the *Antiope* is given by Hyginus, who also enumerates the actors, and both correspond with the new fragments; and a fragment given by Stobaeus is evidently taken from the final chorus which is here recovered.

The myth of *Antiope*, as treated by Euripides, is given by Hyginus in these terms. Antiope, daughter of Nykteus of Thebes, was with child by Zeus, and fearing her father's anger fled to Mount Kithaeron, where the twins Amphion and Zethus were born: she then married Epopeus of Sikyon. Her father died of sorrow, but her uncle Lykos, to avenge him, killed Epopeus and carried Antiope captive to Thebes. Here she endured cruel treatment at the hands of Lykos and Dirke his wife, but eventually escaped to her sons, who had meantime grown up in the care of shepherds on Kithaeron. Hither comes also Dirke to celebrate a Bacchic festival: she seizes Antiope, but is in turn taken by Amphion and Zethus and suffers the punishment of being tied to the bull; this punishment Dirke had herself prepared for Antiope.

Here the narrative of Hyginus ends; but from the few fragments we learn something further, as will be seen. The final *denouement* is thus brought about. Lykos appears in pursuit of Antiope, and is beguiled into an ambuscade by Amphion and Zethus. The longest *Fragment* (C) begins with the close of an excited choral song after Lykos has fallen into the snare prepared for him by the young men. Then he reappears, dragged out by them, a captive about to be slain. After an animated dialogue, Hermes intervenes, stops this new violence, and gives directions to Lykos and Amphion concerning the building of Thebes and the transfer of the monarchy to Amphion. With the acquiescing of Lykos the fragment closes.

Frag. A. Rhesis refuting Antiope's claim that her sons were the offspring of Zeus: might be spoken either by Dirke or Lykos.

Consultation how best to take measures for the capture of Antiope: probably a dialogue in which one of the twins (perhaps Zethus) poses as the guide to draw Lykos into the snare.

Frag. B. At the end is the speech of Lykos, when he first appears on the stage and is introduced by a line of the chorus warning the previous speaker to be silent. The first part is probably a speech of Zethus addressing his mother, calming her fears at the approach of the tyrant; he urges that if Zeus be really, as she says, their father, he will help them in the struggle. The argument seems to be: 'Let us not think how we shall fly, but how we may summon the father that begat us, to help in avenging us. We cannot escape, for the fresh blood of Dirke will convict us of murder; we must either win or die—And now appeal to Zeus above not to indulge in amours with mortals unless he intends to help the children that result. It is ignoble not to stand by one's friends; let him therefore help us to compass the death of this hateful tyrant.'

The writing is arranged in parallel columns of about thirty-five lines each. Prof. Mahaffy thinks that the play was written, not on one large roll of papyrus, but on one side of leaves of a moderate quarto size, with a broad margin; if this be so, the *Antiope* is in this respect unique among ancient papyri; it seems doubtful whether the editor has sufficient evidence to warrant so unusual a conclusion.

If he is right, the entire play must have occupied about twelve leaves of which we have nearly an entire one in *Fragment C*. The uncials are small and compactly written, the forms of letters being those which we meet in inscriptions of the early part of the fourth century. Of the other fragments, the only one to compare with the *Antiope* is that of the *Phaedo* from the same find; according to the editors, the writing of the *Phaedo* is even more highly finished.

(1) I think that in ll. 8, 9, of B we should fill up the lost beginnings by *ὡς μὲν* and *ὅς δ' ἂν* respectively, and read

*ὡς μὲν θανεῖν δεῖ τῷδ' ἐν ἡμέρας φάει
ὅς δ' ἂν τρώπαια πολέμιον στήσας χερσὶν.*

I am sorry to add another to the very small number of 2nd pers. sing. 1st aor. optatives in *-ais*, but there seems to me no doubt about *στήσας* here.

(2) In B, l. 13 I would prefer γήμαντα to Mr. Bury's σπείραντα.

(3) In B, l. 15 Mr. Bury's restoration is obscure, and disregards the evidence of the papyrus as to the last word. I would suggest

ἴθι λαμπρὸς, ἄγρην τ' εὐτυχῇ θεῖς ἐμὴν.

(4) In B, l. 17 Mr. Bury again disregards the evidence which points rather to

τὰ λοιπὰ σ' εἰ χρή δοξάσαι τυραννικόν.

(5) In C, l. 13 I am afraid to say what I believe to be the origin of the words at the beginning and end of the line, and I shall wait till I see the papyrus or a facsimile. I would expect however to see ἔσπευτε in place of ἔπεισεν.

(6) In C, l. 21 the half-obliterated word is surely ζητητικός.

(7) In C, l. 43 Ἰσμήνου is probably a mistake for Ἰσμήνη.

(8) In C, l. 44 I would restore as follows:

σὺ μὲν χερῶν τὸ πνεῦμ' ἐκ πολέμων λαβών.

(9) In C, l. 49 of course TE...MNAI may represent a proper name, but it seems more likely that it is either a mistake for στέρεμναι, a bye-form of στερέμνιος vouched for in ancient lexica, or else is from τέραμνος, a word differently glossed in some lexica, but apparently also glossed as ὑψηλός.

(10) Perhaps l. 50 begins with δέμοντι.

(11) In C, l. 61 the lost letters may be restored in any number of ways; as εἰδειν ἀθέους, εἰδείξ' ἀχρήστους and the like, but it appears to me certain that the next line begins with ἐς σφῶ and that the whole was perhaps

ἐς σφῶ πατρός δοκοῦντας οὐκ εἶναι Διός.

(12) In C, 63 πάρεστε seems to be a mistake for περίεστε.

(13) In C, l. 68 perhaps the lost letters are δι' πεισθείς, and in the next line it is pretty plain that the three last words are ἢ οὐσα γῆς, though opinions may differ as to the word before ἢα.

W. G. RUTHERFORD.

(Hermathena, No. xvii.)

PROFESSOR MAHAFFY's publication of this papyrus (to be followed, one would fain hope, by a facsimile) yields 'delightful employment'—to use his own words—to those who like the game of irresponsible guess-work. And when the guesses have been heaped together, and it is known where they jump,

it will be time to cease from guessing and to begin the sober work of criticism. It is in the spirit thus indicated that the following remarks are offered by one who does not much believe in the possibility of restoring mutilated texts.

I agree with Professor Mahaffy's later judgment in thinking that the right order is B, A, C.

Fr. B.—The first part of this fragment seems to be addressed, not to Antiope, but to Zethus; and, though the conjecture may seem violent, I imagine a line to have dropped out between 9 and 10. This is an accident to which the habit of writing in double columns was very apt to lead. The following is an attempt to reconstruct the passage on this hypothesis, taking advantage of Mr. Bury's hints:—

Amphion.

μὴ διανοῦ δὲ μὴδ' ὅπως φευξοίμεθα.
μάτην γὰρ ἡμᾶς Ζεὺς ἐγέννησεν πατὴρ
πλὴν εἰ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐχθρόν ἀνδρα τίσεται
ἵκται δὲ πάντως εἰς τοσόνδε συμφορᾶς
ὥστ' οὐδ' ἂν ἐκφύγοιμεν εἰ βουλοίμεθα
δίκης νωρὲς αἶμα μὴ δοῖναι δίκην.
μένονσι δ' ἡμῖν εἰς τὸδ' ἔρχεται τύχη
ὥς ἢ θανεῖν δεῖ τῷδ' ἐν ἡμέρας φάει
ἦτοι τροπαῖα πολέμων στήσαι χερί.
[πρὸς πατέρα δ', εἰ χρή πατέρ' ἄγειν ὃς ἐκνόμως
ἔγμην οὕτω μητέρ', ἐξανδῶ τάδε
σὺ δ', ὃς τὸ λαμπρὸν αἰθέρος ναίεις πέδον,
πιθοῦ τοσούτον· Μὴ γαμῖν μὲν ἡδέως
γῆμαντα δ' εἶναι σοῖς τέκνοις ἀνωφελή·
οὐ γὰρ καλὸν τὸδ', ἀλλὰ συμμαχεῖν φίλοις.
νῶν δ' οὖν πρὸς ἄγρην γ' εὐτυχὴς εἴη λιμὴν,
ὅπως ἔλωμεν ἀνδρα δυοσεβέστατον,
ὥς τὸν φύσει χρή δοξάσαι τυραννικόν.]

Fr. A (left column) contains a conversation between Lycus and Amphion, at which Zethus is also present. They have induced the tyrant to come in search of Antiope, and are now decoying him into the cottage in which the ambush is prepared. They feign that they themselves are dead, and that some harmless strangers within the house can give him the information which he seeks. His body-guard is to be left outside. The first line concludes a description of Antiope which is calculated to whet the resolution of Lycus to destroy her.

Amph. ...τὰς δὴ τοιαύτας ἦδομαι καίνων ἐγώ.

Lyc. οὐκ ἀσφαλὲς τὸδ' εἶπας, ἄνθρωπε, στίγος.

Amph. δρᾶν δέ τι κείνους δ' οἷδ' ἐγὼ τεθνηκῶτας.

Lyc. καλῶς ἄρ', εἴπερ οἶσθα, ταξώμεσθα νῦν.

Amph. μὴ τάξιν ἄλλην ἢ δόμων στείχειν ἔσω
ἐν οἷσπερ ἡμεῖς καὶ πρὶν οἰκοῦμεν, ξένη.

Lyc. πῶς οὖν τάχιστ' ἂν τοὺς ξένους ἴδοιμ' ἐγώ ;
Antiph. εἰ τοῖσδ' ἀφείης δορυφόρους ἔξω στέγης.

Lyc. οἱ δ' οὖν ἀφείνται, καὶ μένω δυοῖν πάρα.

Antiph. τὰ λοιπὰ δ' ἡμεῖς καὶ σὺ θήσομεν καλῶς.

Lyc. πόσον τι πληθὺς εἰσιν οἱ ξένοι ; λέγε.

Antiph. παῦροί γε· κοῦκ ἔχουσιν ἐν χερσὶν βέλη.

Lyc. ὑμεῖς ἂν οὖν φρουροῖτε πανταχῇ πέτρας

Antiph. ἐγὼ δὲ παῖδα Νυκτέως ἐμῇ χερὶ
 μάρψω· σὺ δ' ἂν δέχοιο· καὶ τάχ' εἴσεται.

Fr. A (right column).

When Lycus and the brothers have gone within, the Chorus converse with Antiope, who has here entered. In the well-known manner they interrogate her concerning her intercourse with Zeus. More than this it would be rash to affirm, except that σε in l. 6 is the beginning of σεμνὸν or σεπτὸν and that χρῆσ' in l. 10 should be divided χρῆ σ'. I may suggest however for l. 25 παιδὰς δὲ τοὺς Ζηνός γε πῶς τρέφεις, γίναι ;

I have little fresh to offer concerning Fr. C. [left column] except that some use might be made of the scholion on Eur. *Hipp.* 67 (quoted by Nauck) to the effect that a second chorus was employed in this play. For l. 6 I conjecture νευριῶν στένος βρόχοισι καταλαβεῖν. And I do not see why ἐπιπεσοῖσ' ἔλαβεν should not be read in ll. 13, 14. For l. 20 I conjecture ἐκμανθάνους ἂν ὡς τάχος νεκρῶν ἵπο.

Fr. C (right column) offers little scope for conjecture, and it is ill gleaning after M. Henri Weil.

But may I suggest for ll. 49, 50, 51—

πέτραι τέρεμναι μουσικῇ κηλούμεναι
 δέμας δὲ μητρὸς εἰς νεοῦργ' ἐδώλια
 χρυσεῖοτεκτον τεκτόνων θήσει χερσί.

εὐώνυμον κέλευθον ἐξορμωμένους
 ἡμῖν σ', ἀναξ' Ἀμφιον, ὦδ', ἡμᾶς δὲ σοὶ
 σφῶ δ' εἰς πατρῶαν ἑστίαν πεπρωμένω
 τοίγαρ νῦν ὑμεῖς, Ζῆθε κἀμφίων ἀναξ'
 φράζῃ τὸν ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν ἀγέρωχον βίον
 ψευδῇ δε λίσκειν ὅς ἂν ἀπαρνῆσθαι τάδε.
 ἢ πάππος ὑμῶν πρόσθεν ἐξηγησάτο

[Line lost.]

τελῶ· νεκροὶ δὲ τοῦδ' ἄκανστα λείψανα
 αἰδίων εἰς τῶνδ' ὠφέλημα γημόρων
 ρείθροις βρέχουσα τοὺς ἐνότας ἐκ Διός
 ἧς δὴ σὺ γ' ἐξείς παντελῶς μοναρχίαν,
 οὕτω σὺ μὲν κέκλησο Καδμείους ἀναξ,

And for l. 62—

ἐσέφηρσε, πρὶν δοκοῦντας οὐκ εἶναι Διός.

And for l. 68—

Ἐρμῇ πιθόμενος.

The following are mere guesses :—

l. 43. χωρεῖτε πάντες· ἄστου δ' ἰσμηνοῦ πάρα.

l. 44. σὺ μὲν πέδον τόννευμα¹ πολεμίων λαβών.

[Line dropped ?]

Ζῆθ' ὡς προείπον...δ' ἀμφίον.

[Line dropped.]

Nauck's fragment 225—

Ζῆθον μὲν ἐλθεῖν κ.τ.λ.

would seem to be from a different play.

In the speech of Lycus which ends Fr. C several lines appear to be lost, and it is not impossible that here, towards the colophon, though the arrangement has been different hitherto, the two columns may have contained alternate lines. The scribe may have miscalculated the space at his command and tried to save a sheet of papyrus. Observe that the portion to which this applies occupies an equal number of lines in either column (viz. 13). In that case the broken lines 27–35 of C (left column) would belong to Lycus and not to Hermes. On this, which I admit to be a bold supposition, I have attempted the following reconstruction :—

Λυκ. ὦ πολλ' ἄελπτα Ζεὺς τίθεις καθ' ἡμέραν.
 ἔδειξ', ἀπείργων τάσδ' ἀβουλίαις ἐμὰς
 ἐσέφηρσε, πρὶν δοκοῦντας οὐκ εἶναι Διός.
 παρόστε καὶ ζῆτ' ἄχρη μνηστῆς χρόνος
 λείψει μὲν ἡμᾶς, σφῶν δὲ μητέρ' εὐτυχεῖν,
 ἵτε νῦν κρατύνει' ἀντ' ἐμοῦ τῆσδε χθονὸς
 λαβόντε Κάδμου σκηπτρα· τὴν γὰρ ἀξίαν
 σφῶν προστίθησι Ζεὺς, ἐγὼ τε σὺν Διὶ
 Ἐρμῇ πιθόμενος Ἄρεος εἰς κρήνην βαλὼ
 γυναῖκα θάψας· τῆσδ' ὅπως ἐνούσα γῆς
 νασμοῖσι τέγγῃ πέδια Θηβαίας χθονὸς,
 Δίρκῃ πρὸς ἀνδρῶν ὑστέρων κεκλημένη.
 λῦω δὲ νείκη καὶ τὰ πρὶν πεπραγμένα.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

¹ Or τ' ὄγνευμα ? Zethus with his plough is to describe the outline of the new city.

NOTES.

MR. CECIL TORR deals severely with Prof. Mahaffy (*Classical Review*, vol. v. p. 56), for various inaccuracies in his *Greek World under Roman Sway*. Is he quite certain of his own accuracy? He says, 'Leucon had not bestowed gifts of corn' [on the Athenians]: if he will refer to *Leptines*, § 33, he will find the distinct assertion that two years before the date of that speech, *i.e.* in B.C. 357-6, Leucon sent a very large present of grain to supply the wants of the Athenians in a 'bad year.' Strabo, p. 311, also mentions a large present [of 2,100,000 medimni], which may possibly, and indeed probably, be identified with the present mentioned by Demosthenes.

W. HOBHOUSE.

My statement was accurate. Mr. Hobhouse misapprehends both the passages that he cites.

Demosthenes, in *Lept.* 31, says that Leucon allowed ships bound for Athens a priority in loading corn; and consequently, 33, let the Athenians have plenty in a year when other nations could not get enough. Isocrates says the same thing, *Trapes*, 57, but more plainly. The corn was not given.

Strabo, vii. 4, 6, says that in former times corn was largely exported from the Crimea to Greece; for instance, Leucon exported 2,100,000 medimni from Theodosia to Athens. Leucon did not hold Theodosia for many years, and this is probably the aggregate of his exports of corn from that port to Athens during those years. There was no gift. C. T.

* *

EURIPIDES, *Bacchae* 506.—

(Dionysus and Pentheus speaking).

- Δ. αὐδὲ μὲ μὴ δέιν σφαυρῶν οὐ σάφροισιν.
Π. ἐγὼ δὲ δέιν γε κυριώτερος σέθεν.
506 Δ. οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅ τι ζῆς οὐδ' ὄρεῖς οὐδ' ὅστις εἰ.
Π. Πενθεὺς Ἀγαυῆς παῖς πατρὸς δ' Ἐχίονος.
Δ. ἐνδυσταχῆσαι τούνομ' ἐπιτήδειος εἰ.

It is needless to enumerate the conjectures that have been made on l. 506. The first part of the line has been amply defended; the only difficulty lies in the last three words. The simplest correction hitherto proposed is Elmsley's *ἔθ' for οὐδ'*. But (1) it is difficult to see what accident or purpose could have substituted *οὐδ'* for *ἔθ'*, and (2) there is no sense in *ἔθ' ἔτι* here. The point of the remark of Dionysus is explained in his next reply to Pentheus (l. 508). He means to say that Pentheus does not understand the tragic significance of his name. *οὐδ' ὄρεῖς ἔθ' ὅστις εἰ* would imply that there was a time in the past when Pentheus really knew 'who he was.' Moreover the direct form of Pentheus' statement of his name and parents seems hardly natural without some direct interrogation going before. 'Pentheus son of Agave and Echion' presumes a catechetical question, 'What is your name?'

The reading, which I propose for consideration, involves the change of only a single letter and carries with it an explanation of the corruption in the MSS.

οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅ τι ζῆς οὐδ' ὄρεῖς—*οὗτος, τίς εἰ*;

Dionysus abruptly changes his reflexion into the form of a direct question, for the purpose of making Pentheus pronounce his own ill-omened name. *Thou knowest not what thy life is made of nor seest thou—tell me, sir, who art thou?* At *ὄρεῖς* the actor suddenly turns full face to Pentheus. (For *οὗτος, heus tu!* in tragedy see Liddell and Scott.)

The corruption arose simply from a wrong dividing of the last words

ΟΥΤΟΤΙCΕΙ

οὗτος comes so unexpectedly that a copyist might well have paused. *ὅστις εἰ* seemed obvious, and *οὐδ'* for *οὐ* was a natural consequence.

J. B. BURY.

* *

EURIPIDES, *Electra* 797.

τούτων μὲν οὖν μεθείσαν ἐκ μέσου λόγον.

The explanations of *ἐκ μέσου* in this passage given by Paley and Weil are unsatisfactory.

Paley translates 'apart from the company; in private conference with the king.' This meaning is both difficult to extract from the words, and unsuitable to the context. The colloquy between Orestes and Aegisthus was evidently open, and heard by both the messenger and the several attendants.

Weil's words are '*μεθίναμι λόγον ἐκ μέσου, e medio auferre sermonem, laisser un discours, abandonner un sujet de conversation.*' There are at least two objections to this interpretation. Firstly, it hardly suits the context. In the preceding words Orestes had consented to take part with Aegisthus in the sacrifice, in the words immediately following the details of the preparations for the sacrificial rites are given, and it would be very strange to introduce this latter description with the observation that 'they had dismissed the subject.' Secondly, *μεθίναμι λόγον* usually means not 'to discontinue' a speech but 'to utter' it: see for example Hippol. 499 οὐχὶ συγκληῖσεις στόμα, καὶ μὴ μεθήσεις αὐθις αἰσχίστους λόγους; *Id.* 1202 ἡχῶ...βαρὺν βρόχον μεθήκε φρικώδη κλύειν. Herod. 6, 29 Περσίδα γλῶσσαν μετείχε καταμνήνει ἐκνόν. The addition of *ἐκ μέσου* might of course alter the meaning of the words *μεθίναμι λόγον*, but the common use of the latter expression throws grave doubt on Weil's explanation.

Perhaps we should read *εἰς μέσον*, 'thus they spoke for all to hear,' 'in the hearing of all.' This gives the required sense, for we are told that the attendants forthwith began to prepare for the sacrifice, implying that they had heard the conversation, and it also shows how the messenger (who is here speaking) came to know what had passed between Orestes and Aegisthus. The confusion between *ΙC* and *K* is too common to need illustration. Though the phrase *εἰς μέσον* (*λέγειν, προτιθέναι* etc.) is most commonly used where a discussion or contest is implied, yet it is also found where merely an announcement is conveyed or a statement made public, as for example Pindar *Fragment* 171 καλῶν μὲν ἂν μοῖραν τε τερπνῶν ἐς μέσον χρή παντὶ λαῷ δεικνύναι· εἰ δέ τις ἀνθρώποισι θεόδοτος ἀτλάτα κακότης προστύχῃ, ταῦτα σκότει κρύπτειν εἰκοι.

If *ἐκ μέσου* be retained it should not be taken closely with *μεθείσαν* as Weil proposes, but should be translated simply 'in the midst.' The Greeks say 'they spoke thus from the midst' where we would say 'in the midst,' just as they say 'to fight from horseback' (*ἀφ' ἵππων μάχεσθαι*) instead of 'on horseback.' For very remarkable examples of this use of prepositions implying motion even with verbs that exclude the idea of motion see the passages quoted by Professor Jebb on *Antigone* 411, *e.g.* *Il.* 14, 153 Ἥρη...στάσ' ἐξ Οὐλύμποιο.

Hartung conjectures *ἐν μέσῳ*, but the *ductus litterarum* seems to favour *εἰς μέσον*.

CHARLES H. KEENE.

THUC. II. 4, 4.—*γυναικὸς δούσης πέλεκυν λαθόντες καὶ διακόψαντες τὸν μοχλὸν ἐξήλθον οὐ πολλοί*. Stahl reads [*λαθόντες καὶ*]: Herw. *λαθόντες* [*καὶ*]: Cl. proposes *λαθόντες καταδιακόψαντες*. Read *γυναικὸς δούσης πέλεκυν καὶ διακόψαντες τὸν μοχλὸν λαθόντες ἐξήλθον*. For the want of symmetry in *δούσης καὶ διακόψαντες*, cf. Krüger *Gr. Gr.* 56, 14, 2. For the two participles *διακόψαντες*, *λαθόντες*, the first *temporal*, the second *defining* the nature of the finite verb, see Hache, *de Participio Thucyd.* Extrema Pars, p. 3. E. C. MARCHANT.

* *

CICERO, *ad Atticum*, i. 16 § 13.

Sed heus tu! videsne consulatum illum nostrum quem Curio antea ἀποθέων vocabat, si hic factus erit, fabam mimum fatiurum? Qua re, ut opinor, φιλοσοφητόν, id quod tu facis, et istos consulatus non flocci facieon. The meaning is that if a certain worthless Afranius got elected, the Roman consulship, once called by Afranius an ἀποθέωσις, would now be the reverse. The words fabam mimum are generally believed to be corrupt. If so the word ἀποθέωσις, to which they are plainly contrasted, makes it probable that they are a corruption of a Greek word. This hypothesis accounts for the corruption, and is borne out by φιλοσοφητόν and facieon immediately succeeding. Further, while faba in Latin seems to have no political signification, κάματος in Greek is the regular word used of elections by lot, as opposed to those by ballot.

I would suggest therefore *κναμισμόν* for fabam mimum. We should get first cuamismum with faba written as a gloss above the first part of the word: next faba would be written for cua: and by an easy process, fabam mimum would be evolved from fabamismum. With regard to the omission of the s, the various readings nummum, and minimum, and the traces of an erasure in m in the place where the s would occur are to be noticed.

The word *κναμισμόν*, which does not occur elsewhere, need not be objected to in a writer like Cicero. It is a natural formation, and likely in late Greek to displace the formations from -ων, which classical writers used exclusively in the required sense. Plutarch in a doubtful passage has *κναμιστός* = *κναμεντός*.

The sense seems satisfactory, if the emendation be not considered too violent: 'But mark me now! do you see that our glorious Roman consulship, once called by Curio a deification, will, if Afranius is elected, be a mere lottery. Under the circumstances, I think we had better follow your example, and become philosophers, without troubling our heads about such things as consulships.'

* *

PANDITUR INTEREA DOMUS OMNIPOTENTIS OLYMPI.
—Verg. *Aen.* x. 1.

Most commentators, from Servius down, interpret this line as meaning that another day had dawned, and that it was on the third day of the siege that the gods met in council. But there are several considerations that make against this view.

(1) If there is a night between the events of Book ix. and Book x., it is a complete blank. The only Vergilian parallel to such a blank, that is worth considering, occurs between Books x. and xi.; and there the circumstances are essentially different. The beleaguered garrison has now been relieved; Turnus has fled, and the hero next in importance is slain; so that the imagination readily pictures a suspension of hostilities and an interval of well-

earned rest, when the following dawn is announced. In the present case however it is the second night of active siege, following an eventful first night, when, in the absence of any statement to the contrary, both parties might have been expected to be on the extreme alert—and we feel the want of incident. It is difficult to believe that Vergil, who usually heralds the approach of evening with some circumstance, should have passed over such a night absolutely without remark. How he does deal with a night of siege, when he wishes to avoid repetition, may be gathered from x. 146 *sqq.*, where, after telling us that the fighting was over for the time being, he occupies our attention with other matters until the morrow's sun rises (256).

(2) When Vergil formally begins a day he commonly names the goddess of dawn, and invariably emphasises the accession of *light*. If x. 1, without a syllable of luminous import, is 'an impressive phrase for daybreak,' it is the only phrase of the kind in the *Aeneid*.

(3) There appears to be no good reason, poetic or other, why Jupiter should have deferred convening the assembly until the third day. In x. 6 *sqq.* he remonstrates with the gods for being still at strife. The remonstrance would have come with greater force and fitness at the supreme juncture on the second day. I think Jupiter's language in x. 107 *sqq.* (*hodie ... exortae*) decidedly in favour of the second day.

(4) As a description of a whole day's siege, x. 118–45 is inadequate and even weak. Why should Vergil have perpetrated such an anti-climax after the stirring events of the day before? It is to be noted in particular that Turnus does not appear at all in these lines, whereas Mnestheus is to the fore, elate with triumph. Referred to the afternoon of the day when the former was expelled from the Trojan camp exhausted, both facts are significant enough. The absence of the Rutulian hero requires explanation on any other hypothesis.

The truth seems to be that x. 1 merely announces the throwing open of the council-chamber which Jupiter leaves in x. 117. In fixing the time at which this was done, let it be observed that in x. 107 *sqq.* Jupiter declares emphatically that he will henceforth allow the fates to take their course without any interference from him between Turnus and Aeneas. Now in ix. 803 Jupiter did interfere to very good purpose, so that the council could not have met before that point. In the presence of *interea* at the beginning of Book x. it is natural to suppose that the council met immediately after; and that in fact the critical situation of the Trojans, which induced Jupiter to intervene in their behalf, impelled him at the same time to convene and rebuke the gods. Venus's language in x. 22, 23 is consistent with the supposition that Turnus was in the Trojan camp while she was speaking; indeed it fits that supposition best, preceded as it is by the reference to Turnus's earlier chariot-riding (apparently ix. 691). We need not suppose with Heyne that this council was held towards evening. If x. 118–45 is descriptive of the close of the second day, as I believe it to be, the council can hardly have met later than the early afternoon. It is to be remembered that the Rutuli had commenced the attack at day-break (ix. 459), so that they would have had the whole morning for the events described in the latter half of Book ix. I infer Vergil's idea to have been that the gods met about the middle of the second day, and that meanwhile (*interea* x. 118) the battle continued raging.

Aeneas would thus return to the camp about twenty-four hours after the death of Nisus and Euryalus.

WALTER J. EVANS.

CAPER p. 103 K.—The contraction for *autem* (*haulem*) commonly found in Irish and Anglo-Saxon MSS., viz. *h* with a small curved stroke like a *c* rising from the shoulder of the letter, has been productive of many corruptions in Latin MSS. Here is a new instance from Capet: *Orthographia* (Keil, vol. vii. p. 103): *sic militis puer galearius recte dicitur: nam galearia solocismus est. non est puer galearia: nam pueram sic rite vocas: puer est galearius † hic a solocus.* Read *puer galearius autem asolocus.* The best MS. omits *est*.

W. M. LINESAY.

* *

Μερεμύχωνις.—It is stated in the last edition of Liddell and Scott that this word 'seems to be of no authority,' but it will be found in the Exo. Vat. of Diodorus p. 29, or Book x. 6 of the edition of Vogel in the Teubner series; 'Ὅτι δὲ Πυθαγόρας μερεμύχωνιν ἐδίδαξε καὶ κρεοφαγίαν ὡς ἀποτρόπαιον ἡγείτο, πάντων τῶν ζῴων τὰς ψυχὰς μετὰ θάνατον εἰς ἕτερα ζῷα λήγων εἰσέρχεσθαι.

J. H. SWAINSON.

'STANKO : AN ILLUSTRATION IN OLD ENGLISH.

'Stanko' is a grotesque name-growth from *ἐς τὰν Κῶ*.

It is, I think, noteworthy that there is handed down to us just such a name-growth—happily abortive—in English topographical nomenclature.

Ex-eter is, it can scarce be doubted (despite of Horsley), the *Isca* of Ptolemy (2. 3. 30). It is also, in all probability, the *Isca Dumnoniorum* of the 12th and 15th Itineraries. It is said by Roger Hoveden, in whose time (that of Henry II.) Cornish was still a living language, to have had in British the same name as Caerleon-on-*Usk*, namely *Caerwisc*, which, says he, meant '*civitas aquae*.'

Its first post-Roman appearance is in Willibald's *Vita Bonifacii*. There it appears as *Adescanastre* (Pertz's reading, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.* tom. ii. p. 335, from the Carlsruhe MS.), with the variants *Adestan-castre*, *Adescanacstre*, and *Ad escan castre*. This last form reveals what one may call the scaffolding of the denomination. '*Ad*' is evidently the Old English *æt*.

J. HOSKYNs-ABRAHALL.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GREECE.

Megalopolis.—The results of the recent excavations of the theatre here have conclusively proved the existence of a Greek stage, in addition to the Roman one, and therefore Dr. Dörpfeld's theory will not hold. Its date is not yet finally ascertained, but as inscriptions have been discovered in the auditorium dating from the fourth century B.C., the presumption is that the stage is of the same date.¹

The portion of the Edict of Diocletian discovered here by the British School at Athens has been edited, with a commentary, by Mr. W. Loring. The chief points of interest in it are as follows: (1) the date of the Edict is fixed by the number of the consulships and tenures of the *Tribunica potestas* assigned to its promulgators, as the last quarter of the year A.D. 301; (2) in form it is an *edictum ad provinciales*, i.e. the provincials are directly addressed; (3) the Edict is for the whole Empire; (4) the sums named are maximum, not fixed prices; (5) wilful disobedience of the Edict was punishable by death or deportation; (6) the result of the Edict is mentioned by Lactantius (a contemporary writer) *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, ch. 7; (7) the prices are reckoned in denarii, with the symbols X , Y , and Φ . This denarius is the copper coin of the later empire, and equivalent to $\frac{1}{16}$ of the solidus (cf. *Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1885 p. 222 sqq.); (8) the only weights and measures occurring in this portion of the inscription are the pound (*λίτρα*), the ounce (*ὀγκία*), the modius, and the mile (*μέλιον*); (9) evidently there was no authorised Greek version of the Edict; hence the variation in the wording of the different copies, etc.¹

THE AEGEAN SEA.

Lesbos.—Koldewey's excellent publication *Die Antiken Baureste der Insel Lesbos*, 1890, gives a de-

tailed account of the results recently obtained here. At Mytilene little is left, beyond an aqueduct, and one stone of the theatre *in situ*; the plan of the city, however, has been successfully restored. Of the harbour, part of the walls have been found, and on the south side a harbour for triremes outside the city wall, opposite to the mainland, also the *ναυπηγία* and *ψώκραι* on the mainland. At Messa an Ionic pseudo-peripteral temple has been excavated, with 8 x 13 columns and Doric antae, but little more than the foundations remain. At Kolumdado remains of an archaic temple have come to light, also a colonnade (Puchstein p. 58), on some of the square stones of which have been found the most ancient forms of clamps known. The site of Antissa is fixed on the north side of the island. At Arisba ancient walls have been discovered closely resembling those at Tyrins.²

ASIA MINOR.

Cilicia.—Mr. J. Theodore Bent's excavations have produced the following results: At Anazarba walls of Roman work remain, but unfortunately they are too ruinous to allow of identifying sites, or reconstructing the plan of the town. There was probably a long colonnade through the centre of the town from Justinian's gate, as was usual in Cilician towns. Ruins of the two aqueducts and other unimportant buildings remain. To the south of the mountains is a stadium three-quarters of a mile long, with rows of seats still discernible, cut in the rock; in front of it is a Corinthian colonnade, at the back a promenade. Above the wall at the back are numerous rock-cut tombs and sarcophagi with inscriptions, late Roman and early Christian. To the north are traces of public buildings, including a theatre cut in the rock; also several fallen columns, tombs, and bas-reliefs (one with figures of four nude athletes and a robed figure holding a chaplet and palm-branch). On the summit of the mountain is the Acropolis, the ruins being all of Armenian date. Further to the north

¹ *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. xi. pt. 2. pp. 294 sqq.

² *Berl. Phil. Woch.* January 24th.

are two cave-tombs, one with a relief of the three Erinyes.

At Kars-Bazaar were found three stelae with inscriptions, and in the floor of a cottage a fine tessellated pavement, with a Christian inscription. This place is probably the ancient Flaviopolis, though there is no direct evidence.

At Budronm it was impossible to make out accurately the line of the ancient walls. In the town was a long colonnade, with a double row of columns, 320 yards in length, from the south gateway to the back of the theatre; the columns are of blue and red conglomerate with Corinthian caps and Ionic bases. The theatre is of considerable size, later than that at Anazarba, and built, not cut out of the rock; the proscenium is sixty feet in length. Fifteen inscriptions have been found which identify the site as Hieropolis, the seat of the worship of Artemis Perasia. Close to the colonnade in the centre of the town are foundations of the *ἱερὸν* and *temenos* of the temple of Artemis Perasia, as the inscription on a stèle dug up there shows.¹

EGYPT.

Mr. Petrie's excavations in the Fayum have brought to light some very interesting examples of early Greek pottery. Of these some were found in a tomb of 1100 B.C. at Kahun; also 'false amphorae' and an archaic female figure in terra-cotta, ranging from 1400 to 1050 B.C. Other specimens go back even further, to 2500 B.C., with patterns of 'Aegean' origin; some of these have incised patterns on a black ground, resembling the early Italian 'bucchero'-ware. These would seem to be products of the wave of Graeco-Libyan conquest which swept over Egypt from time to time.²

Journal of Hellenic Studies, vol. xi. pt. 2. October 1890.

1. The Alkmene-vase formerly in Castle Howard. A. S. Murray. (Two Plates).

Mr. Murray agrees with Engelmann in interpreting the principal scene as representing Alkmene taking refuge on an altar to escape the wrath of Amphitryon, Antenor setting fire to a pyre erected in front of the altar, and Zeus sending a storm by the agency of the Hyades to extinguish the fire. He regards it as a production of Southern Italy, about 350–300 B.C.

2. Recent discoveries in Eastern Cilicia. J. T. Bent. (With Map). Also, Inscriptions from the same. E. L. Hicks.

¹ *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. xi. pt. 2, p. 231.

² *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. xi. pt. 2, p. 271.

3. Collection of Ancient Marbles at Leeds. E. L. Hicks. (With Plate).

Most of these are inscribed; one of them bears a document relating to a dispute between Paros and Naxos. The collection contains two richly ornamented marble doors.

4. Egyptian Bases of Greek History. W. M. Flinders Petrie. (With Plate).

5. The Making of Pandora. A. H. Smith. (Two Plates).

An interpretation of the sculptured drum from the later Artemision at Ephesos. The seated figure on the extreme right is Zeus; at the extreme left is Hephaistos, leaning on a stick as in the Parthenon frieze; in the middle, Pandora, as if just starting on a journey, not stiff as on the vases. The remaining figures are deities bestowing their gifts; next to Zeus is probably Hera, or possibly Peitho (cp. Hes. *Op. et D.* 73); on either side of Pandora are Eros and Hermes. The former is represented in his dark and grievous aspect (Hes. *Op.* l. 65); the mouth of Hermes is open as if breathing the gift of speech into her (Hes. *Op.* l. 79). The relief is perhaps copied from that by Pheidias on the base of the Parthenos statue. Pandora is equivalent to the Asiatic Artemis; hence her appropriateness in this case.

6. Two Greek Reliefs. G. C. Richards.

He identifies the Charites-relief on the Akropolis at Athens by means of a similar inscribed relief in the Naples Museum. The name of the smaller figure in the latter case is Telonnesos, therefore the Akropolis-group was probably a votive offering from that place.

7. Fourteenth-Century Tachygraphy. T. W. Allen. (Two Plates).

8. The Theatre at Megalopolis. E. A. Gardner and others.

9. A New Portion of the Edict of Diocletian from Megalopolis. W. Loring.

10. Orphic Myths on Attic Vases. C. H. Smith.

He notes the connexion between the myths of Zagreus and the Kabeiroi, and the mixture of the solemn and dignified with the ribald and grotesque, as on the vases from the Kabeirion at Thebes.

Berlin Philologische Wochenschrift, January 24. Review of *Studien zur Aphrodite von Melos*. C. Haeblerlin. Göttingen, 1889.

He suggests on aesthetic grounds that the right hand covered the line of demarcation between the drapery and the nude part of the body, and considers that the apple was not the 'meed of fairest' but the ordinary attribute of the goddess. On the coins of Magnesia Aphrodite appears with a sceptre and apple, with the inscription Ἀφρο. Μῆλεια Μαγνητῶν. This might well be a reproduction of the statue.

H. B. WALTERS.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE 'HOUSE AT DELOS.'

STUDENTS of Greek antiquities are familiar with the ground-plan of an alleged house at Delos, as also with the elevation of its vestibule. The original sponsors for this interesting edifice are Guhl and Koner, who, in their *Leben der Griechen und Römer* § 22, say that its discoverers took it improbably

for a public bath. Turning to the list of illustrations at the end of the volume, we learn that the plan and view given are taken from the third volume of the *Ionian Antiquities*. Winckler (*Die Wohnhäuser der Hellenen*, p. 74) respectfully records Guhl and Koner's opinion. With Durm (*Die Baukunst der Griechen*, p. 240) the building has become simply 'das bekannte Haus in

Delos.' And now in the new edition of Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*, p. 659, we read: 'In the Ionian Antiquities is figured a Greek house at Delos, of which a ground-plan is given by Guhl and Koner.'

The only archaeologist, so far as I am aware, who has ventured to throw doubts on this monument is M. Pierre Paris. In the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1884, p. 474, he says: 'Je dois avouer que, malgré mes recherches dans l'île de Délos, je n'ai rien trouvé de cette construction. Le volume anglais [des "Ionian Antiquities"] n'existe, à ma connaissance, dans aucune bibliothèque d'Athènes; la traduction allemande de Wagner ne parle pas de ce monument, et le volume de planches ne contient pas celles qu'ont reproduites Guhl et Koner.' He proceeds to point out some difficulties in the plan and concludes: 'Tout cela prouve qu'étant même admise l'existence de l'édifice, il faut se défier du plan.'

M. Paris's failure to find the plan and view given by Guhl and Koner was due to the fact that the German translation of the *Antiquities of Ionia*, published in 1829, does not include the third volume (1840). But is it not a little remarkable that no other of the authorities cited above should have 'verified his reference'? Any one doing so would have found at once that the building in question was at *Cnidus*. As for the character of the building, the explorers offered the conjecture that it might have been a bath (p. 20). The only reason given by Guhl and Koner for disputing this is the moderate size of the building. Can they have read the text or examined the plan with sufficient care to discover that the dimensions were 190 ft. x 90 ft.? This gives an area much exceeding that of the small *Thermae* of Pompeii, excluding surrounding shops. Whatever the structure was, the notion that it was a dwelling-house has, at any rate, nothing to stand on.

There is a veritable house at Delos, described by M. Paris in the article above quoted. Let us hope that we shall hear no more of the fictitious one.

F. B. TARBELL.

Bibliothèque des Monuments Figurés Grecs et Romains. Vol. II. Peintures des Vases Antiques recueillies par Millin et Millingen: publiées et commentées par SALOMON REINACH. Firmin-Didot et Cie.: Paris.

It is only two years since I welcomed in this journal the inaugural volume of M. S. Rei-

nach's great scheme, which promises to be of extraordinary use in the work of study and teaching, by bringing within the range of the ordinary purse the indispensable yet often inaccessible collections of archaeological illustrations. The present volume contains reproductions of the 150 plates of ancient vases published in Millin's two folio volumes *Peintures de vases antiques vulgairement appelés Étrusques*, and of the 63 plates in Millingen's *Peintures Antiques et Inédites de Vases Grecs*. The reproductions are of good size, quite clear and distinct, and deserve high commendation. M. Reinach also writes an introduction of 142 pages (besides a preface of xv.), in which he analyses or occasionally reproduces verbatim the text of the original authors, and gives every fact of permanent value that has been stated by them; while he also quotes enough to show the style and character of their writing. But this statement is far from exhausting the merits of the work, and the labour that has been spent on it. What has been said proves that the owner of this volume is for ordinary practical work as well off as if he had the costly original volumes; but I may add that the worker who already possesses the originals will find it advisable also to possess the reproduction. Millin's drawings are often inaccurate, and M. Reinach often makes most important corrections in his introduction. The latter also discusses the interpretation of the subjects from the modern point of view, traces as far as possible the history of each vase (a task which in many cases must have involved great labour), states clearly how much remains unknown in regard to it, and gives a list of other references to and reproductions of each vase. In many pages of the introduction one is struck by other indications of the wide range of M. Reinach's knowledge, and of the information that he gives on many other points besides those just enumerated. For example, on pp. 6, 7 we find a very full account of the collection of the Château Malmaison and of the unfinished publication, of which only a single copy of *Livr. I.* is known to M. Reinach. We should be glad to know if a copy exists in the British Museum or the Bodleian. The list of references in subsequent literature will often be found very useful, and especially so by novices in the subject: such a list cannot of course be made complete by any single man, and is in the case of important vases impossible from their very number. In cases where subsequent references give important additional information, this is stated by M. Reinach (e.g. the form of the

vase); occasionally even a second more complete representation of the picture is given. All the new information contained in the introduction is expressed in a direct and simple style which adds to its usefulness; and, while the faults of the two old writers are plainly stated, all is done so obviously for the sake of usefulness, not of vain-glory, that the work will, if I am not mistaken, add greatly to the reputation of both Millin and Millingen. A series of indices adds to the usefulness of the volume, which assures to the *Bibliothèque des Monuments Figurés* a place in the list of 'indispensable and accessible' works not merely for archaeologists, but for all true scholars. The current idea, that works like this are only for archaeologists, and that the literature of Greece is for scholars alone, cannot continue much longer to impede the progress of classical studies in England.

I can only hope that Vol. III. may soon appear, and that (as some prospect was held out in the preface of Vol. I.) it may be the inaccessible *Antiquités du Bosphore Cimmérien*, of which only two hundred copies were printed. The popular account recently translated by M. Reinach from the Russian of Prof. Kondakof and Count J. Tolstoi by its profuse illustration only brings home more vividly to us the value of the great work.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE British Museum has lately acquired a marble stelè, sculptured with a relief of a draped female figure and inscribed 'Εννύρια Μοσχίλων Μελένια. This stelè has had a curious history. In the seventeenth century it was seen at Athens by Spon, and copied by him. From that source the inscription has been repeated by Boeckh (*C.I.G.* 706), Kumanides (*Epigr. Epitumb.* 2121), and in the *Corpus Inscr. Attic.* (iii. 2660). Among the drawings of Fourmont in the Bibliothèque at Paris Prof. Conze tells me there is a sketch of this stelè. How or at what time it reached this country is not known. All that has been ascertained is that the stelè was found many years ago when digging foundations at 67 New Bond Street. It was lying 15 feet below the surface. The probability is that some English traveller had brought it from Athens in the last century, and that it had been lost sight of in the course of building operations, like some of the marbles of Lord Gifford. The stelè was next moved to the garden of a house at Hampstead, where I chanced to see and recognize it. The owner at once presented it to the Museum.

A. S. M.

PROPOSED EXCAVATIONS AT CHESTER.

THE necessity for reform in the excavation of ancient sites in Britain, and especially in the publication of the results obtained, has long been evident; Prof. Pelham's article in the *Classical Review* for Feb. 1891, p. 74, was a clear statement of the case, and showed the defects of the system, or rather the want

of system, that has hitherto obtained. What is most needed is that the scattered records of the Roman period of our history should be collected, and that investigations should be controlled and studied by scholars of experience and standing. While we are paying large sums of money for the prosecution of research abroad, our treasures at home are comparatively neglected, not so much because sufficient energy is wanting, but because hitherto the energy has been misdirected.

It is therefore very satisfactory to welcome the scheme of which the prospectus has just been issued. It is signed by Professors Pelham and Middleton, Dr. John Evans, Mr. Haverfield, and others, and appeals for additional subscriptions to set on foot fresh explorations in the North Wall of Chester.

It will be remembered that some repairs lately executed in this Wall resulted in the discovery of Roman inscriptions and sculptures, and a further exploration started by the Chester Archaeological Society produced more inscriptions and sculptures. Of all the historic sites in England, none are so likely to aid our knowledge of Roman history as the Roman military centres, and it is well known that Deva was garrisoned by the Twentieth Legion from the earliest times until the end of the Roman occupation of our island.

The exploration will begin in a part of the North Wall which is now under repair, in which a preliminary search has revealed inscribed and sculptured stones. It will be carried out by the City Surveyor, who conducted the former excavations to a successful issue. Inscriptions and sculptures found will be the property of the Corporation, and will be deposited, with those previously discovered, in the Grosvenor Museum at Chester. The results of the excavations will be published by Prof. Pelham and Mr. Haverfield.

Several subscriptions have already been promised, and an appeal is now made for more. The work is necessarily more expensive than 'digging,' and the space which ought to be examined is large. The probability of finding inscriptions is, however, very great, and the work has claims on both patriotism and scholarship.

Subscriptions may be sent to Prof. Pelham, 20 Bradmore Road, Oxford, or to F. Haverfield Esq., Lancing College, Shoreham, Sussex.

Annuaire de la Société franç. de Numismatique. July—Aug. 1890.

W. Froehner. 'Le nome sur les monnaies d'Égypte.' Contents that the types on the nome-coins of Egypt consist of personifications of each nome and do not, as usually supposed, portray the divinities worshipped in the nome. The nome-coins were struck at Alexandria and not at the nomes themselves. (The no. for Sept.—Oct. contains no articles on ancient Numismatics.)

Nov.—Dec. 1890.

W. Froehner. 'Variétés Numismatiques.' A new coin of Elagabalus.

Numismatic Chronicle. Part iv. 1890.

Arthur J. Evans. 'Some new artists' signatures on Sicilian coins.' Among these is the signature on a coin of Himera, issued *circa* B.C. 470—450, of an engraver Kimon, possibly the grandfather of the Kimon whose name appears on fine coins of Syracuse.—Warwick Wroth. 'Greek coins acquired by the British Museum in 1889.' The total number of Greek coins acquired is 347 and the paper, which is accompanied by an autotype plate, describes the most

noteworthy specimens. A splendid didrachm of Sybrita in Crete, a new gold stater of Lampasacus (obverse, Head of Demeter) and a unique electrum stater of Mytilene inscribed **MYTI** are especially important additions to the national collection.—Reviews (by B. V. Head) of J. Evans's 'Coins of the Ancient Britons (Supplement)' and of Svoronos's *Νομίσματα ἀνάλεκτα* (reprinted from the *Ephemeris*, 1890). This part also contains Indexes to the last ten volumes of the 'Numismatic Chronicle.'

W. W.

Revue Numismatique. Quatrième trimestre. 1890.

E. Babelon. 'Alabanda et Antioche, villes de Carie.' Distinguishes the coins of Antioch on the Maeander from those of Alabanda, a town which between the years B.C. 197 and 189 bore the name of

Antioch.—J. A. Blanchet. 'Remarques relatives aux signes gravés sur les Contorniates.'

Zeitschrift für Numismatik. Berlin. Band xvii., Heft 3 and 4, 1890.

A. von Sallet. 'Die Erwerbungen des Königlichen Münzcabinet vom 1 April 1888 bis 1 April 1889.' The acquisitions include thirty-two Greek and fourteen Roman coins.—H. Dressel. 'Titikazos.' This place was till now supposed to be unknown except through bronze coins of Imperial times. Dressel points out that it is mentioned several times in Galen in connexion with its wine which had certain medicinal qualities. Its site is not stated, but it may be inferred from these passages that it was either in Chios or on the coast of Asia Minor between Pergamum and Smyrna. M. Waddington had conjectured that Titikazos was in Mysia (see Ramsay's *Hist. Geog. Asia Minor*, p. 456).

W. W.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Philology. No. 43. October, 1890.

On the articular infinitive in Polybius. Part i. E. G. W. Hewlett. More frequent in Polybius than in any classical author except Demosthenes. It occurs in P. 1628 times and the average frequency is higher in the excerpts than in the first five books. In the use of the art. infin. P. does not go beyond the limits fixed in Attic prose. The attempt of E. Lammer to remove every instance of the final genitive of the art. infin. from P. unsuccessful. *The value of the Mediae* (b, d, g) in *Old Latin and Italic*. R. S. Conway. Seeks to show that the mediae were either voiceless or whistled in pro-ethnic Italic. May they not have been so also in pro-ethnic Indo-European? *The Codex Matritensis of Plutarch and Plut. Cic.* 29. A. Gudeman. For διὰ Τύλλου τῆς (Cod. Mat. add. *Ταραντίου*) G. conjectures διὰ Κατέλλου thus bringing the poet into direct connexion with Clodia as her lover. Cod. Matr. shown to be especially untrustworthy in proper names. In *Ciris* 471, 2 R. Ellis conjectures Ceos...Sunias for Venus...Sinias. Among the books reviewed are Kawczynski's *Essai comparatif sur l'origine et l'histoire des rythmes*, by F. M. Warren, 'the most important single work on versification which has appeared in recent times.' S. Sobolewski, *De prae-positionum usu Aristophaneo*, and I. Iltz, *De vi et usu prae-positionum ἐπὶ, μετὰ, παρὰ, περί, πρός, ὑπό* apud Aristophanem, reviewed by Prof. Gildersleeve. The former enforces 'the great lesson of the faithfulness of the comic poet to the prose standard of his time'; the latter, apart from convenient statistics, does not further our knowledge. A. Kiessling *Q. Horatius Flaccus* Part i., Odes and Epodes, 2nd edition, reviewed by E. H. Spieker. 'A decided improvement on what was in itself an excellent edition.' There are brief mentions of Stock's *pro Roscio* and Rutherford's *Greek Syntax*.

Hermathena. No. xvii. 1891.

The new fragments of the *Antiope* of Euripides are mentioned in another column.—Among other papers are *Sophoclea* by R. Y. Tyrrell: *O.C.* 547 κῆμ' ἀλαῶς γ' ἐφόνευσα καὶ ἔλεσα, 702 τὸ μὲν τις οὐ νεαρὸς οὐδὲ γῆρας (partic.) | σημάτων ἁλιώσαι χερὶ πέρας, 709 πέδον (for

χθονός), 936 κορῶ (for τῇ νῆ), 1036 ὦν (for ὅν), 1454 ἐπιὼν μὲν (for MSS. ἐπεὶ μὲν: στέφον μὲν Hartung, Jebb); *Ant.* 343 ἀγρεῖ (for ἀγει), 966 παρὰ δὲ Κρανναίων πελάθει διδύμας θ' ἄλδς | ἀκταῖς βοσπορλασιν ὁ Θρηκῶν ἄξενος | Σαλμυθσός or πελάθων διδύμας ἄλδς | ἀκταῖς βοσπορλασί θ' ὁ Θρηκῶν.—A. Palmer suggests in *Juvenal.* 1,151 vitiumst. eia! (for vitium stetit); 2,171 bacae (for braciae); 2, 649 contoque (for scutoque); 9,133 area maior | spe superest (for altera maior spes); 14, 216 naturā aemula nequitia est (for naturae mala nequitia est): Tibull. 1, 6, 73 ducarque capillis | inmerito propriis, proripiarque foras (for proprias...vias).—The same scholar gives a number of observations on the fragments of the *Latin Scenic Poets*.—F. H. M. Blaydes, *Notae in Theophrasti characteres*.—J. B. Bury, *Charles the Great and Irene*:—suggests that I. deposed and blinded her son in 767 in order to replace him by a husband—Charles the Great. This was the object of the embassy of 798.

Theologische Quartalschrift. Herausgegeben von KOBER, FUNK, SCHANZ, KEPPLER, BELSER. 72 JAHRGANG. Tübingen, 1890.

AMONGST books reviewed (by Funk) we note: *A. Miodonski, Anonymus adversus aleatores*, maintains (against Harnack) that the treatise is a homily composed in Rome during the iii. century, possibly by Bishop Melchisedes (*Miltiades*) *natione Afer*.—A. Hilgenfeld, *lib. de aleatoribus*, attributes the book to one of the Novatian bishops of the iv. century, to Acesius 325, or his predecessor.—A. C. McGiffert, *Ἀντιβολὴ Παπίσκου καὶ Φιλωνος Ἰουδαίων πρὸς μόναχόν τινα* edited with introduction and notes, a work of the v. century written in Egypt.—Holder, *Inventio sanctae crucis*, publishes the legend according to the oldest Latin MS. Cod. Paris. 2769, of the vi. or vii. century, together with a hymn on the holy cross composed in the vi. century, from the Reichenau MS. 244.—L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, gives a description and exposition of the catholic services, which were in use in the Western Church from the iv.—ix. centuries.

II. A. Ehrhard, *Zur christlichen Epigraphik*. An account is given of *De Rossi, Series codicum in quibus veteres inscriptiones Christianae praesertim urbis Romae sive solae sive ethnicis admixtae descriptae sunt ante*

saeculum xvi. 1888, and an explanation offered of the reasons which induced the Roman archaeologist to deviate from the plan, adopted in the earlier part of his great work, published thirty years before, *Corp. inscript. christ. Urbis Romae* 1857—61. Dr. Ehrhard suggests (p. 185 note) a collection of inscriptions, less expensive than the folios of the Corpus, of interest to other than students of divinity, and corresponding to *Dittenberger, sylloge inscr. graec. Lips.* 1883 and *Willmann, Exempla inscript. lat. Berlin* 1873.—*Funk, Die Zeit der ersten Synode von Arles.* A defence is set up for Aug. 314, as the date of the synod, against O. Seeck, who argued that Constantine, who defeated Licinius at Cibellae on the 8 Oct. 314, could not have presided at Arles two months before. It is doubtful (F. points out) whether the emperor was really present; the letter which the synod sent to Pope Silvester makes no mention of the fact, as for instance the letter of the council of Nicea does to the church of Alexandria (*Socr.* 1, 9). The books reviewed (by Funk) are: *S. Brandt, Dual. Zusätze und die Kaiseranreden bei Lactantius.* The passages Instit. ii., 8; vii., 5; De opif. Dei c. 19, showing traces of manichaean doctrine as well as the speeches addressed to Constantine, are proved to be interpolations, dating from the end of the iv. century.—*J. Dräseke, gesammelte patristische Untersuchungen*, published before in various periodicals.—*A. Jahn, Dionysiaca*, adduces instances of ling. affinities that exist between D. Areopagita and the Platonists, especially Proklus.—*P. Baumgarten, Die Einheit des Hermas-Buches*, defends the unity of H. against Hilgenfeld, supposes the work consisted of two independent books—the first book containing the Visions (*Vis. i.—iv.*), the second containing the Mandates and Similitudes—which were afterwards united.—*E. Hückstädt, Der Lehrbegriff des Hirten*, furnishes a systematic exposition of the doctrine of Hermas, based on Harnack's commentary.—*P. Battifol, Studia Patristica Fasc. i.*, offers the first instalment of his studies on early Christian literature. The book before us publishes for the first time the Greek text of 'the marriage of Joseph,' a narrative of Jewish origin of the v. century, which was revised by a Christian writer.

III. *Belser, Über Johannes den Täufer.* An account is given of the life of John the Baptist in accordance with the various statements contained in the Gospels. Amongst books reviewed (by Funk) we note: (1) *J. Wilpert, Prinzipienfrage der christlichen Archäologie*, impugns the position taken up by Hasenclever and Achelis in regard to symbolism of early Christian art.—(2) *J. Führer, Felicitasfrage*, proves the acts of the martyrdom of Felicitas and her seven sons, assigned to the year 162, to be of far later date, and the legend itself to have sprung up from a confusion of the Roman martyrs of the 10 July, with that witness of the faith who suffered on the 23 Nov.

IV. *P. Vetter, Der apokryphe dritte Korintherbrief.* The apocryphal correspondence between St. Paul and the Corinthians is stated to have been composed in Syria, perhaps at Edessa, during the reign of king Abgar, as a polemical treatise against the gnostic Bardesanes. A translation of the letters is given as well as of a commentary, purporting to have been written by Ephraem Syrus (and drawn up certainly not later than 400 A.D.), which appears to have hitherto escaped the notice of editors. C. MERK.

Jahresbericht des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin. Feb.-March, 1890.

THE LITERATURE OF SALLUST, 1880-1890, by F. Schlee. [*Comp. Classical Review* ii. 25 foll.]

I. Editions. C. Sallusti Crispi *bellum Catilinae, bellum Jugurthinum, etc.* A. Scheindler, 1883. The text generally follows Jordan. In the speeches and letters J. has undervalued Vat. 3864 (V) which S. rightly prefers when it agrees with some other MSS. of class C or testimonies of grammarians. *Bellum Catilinae und bellum Jugurthinum*, Ign. Prammer, 1886. The text founded on Dietsch's fourth edition. The editor undertakes to remove all 'portenta' and 'prodigia' from the text and to that extent removes Sallust himself (cf. Suet. gram. 15). *Catilina, Jugurtha, etc.*, H. Jordan, third edition, 1887. Since J.'s death P. Krüger has completed the work and incorporated the recently discovered Orléans-fragment. *Catilina, Jugurtha, etc.* A. Eussner, 1888. The present Teubner text. E. (whose recent death is to be lamented) mostly agrees with Jordan in the text but does not give so much weight to the old grammarians. All E.'s own conjectures are worthy of attention. *Bellum Catilinae, bellum Jugurthinum, etc.* G. Linker. Second edition by Ph. Klmscha, 1888. A good school edition. *De conjuratione Catilinae et de bello Jugurthino libri* etc. R. Jacobs. Ninth edition by H. Wirz, 1886. In the notes much is shortened and much struck out, a good deal is altered and rearranged especially in the Catilina. *Bellum Catilinae und de bello Jugurthino*, J. H. Schmalz, second edition 1885/6. The text is essentially Jordan's. Like most later editors S. follows Par. 500 (P) more closely than J. does. The elucidations are chiefly devoted to the meanings of words and constructions. *De Catilinae conjuratione, de bello Jugurthino libri*. K. Kappes, 1885. Text mostly after Scheindler. Few notes on subject matter but many translations. *Conjuration de Catilina*. F. Antoine et R. Lallier, 1888. Text after Jordan. Contains in the introduction the most important results of Sallustian criticism.

II. Criticism and elucidation. L. Kuhlmann, *De Sallustii cod. Par. 500*. Progr. von Oldenburg, 1881. ib. *Quaestiones Sallustianae criticae*. Progr. von Oldenburg, 1887. The question of the cod. settled by Jordan who puts P at the head. K. an ardent admirer of P, but he unduly depreciates V. Ph. Klmscha, *Sallustianische Miscellen*. Progr. Kremsier, 1882. Determines the relations of P to V and shows from the similarity of the corruptions that the two MSS. are from a common source. R. Mollweide, *Über die Glossen zu Sallust*. Progr. Strassburg, 1888. M. publishes specimens of Sallust scholia from six Munich MSS. and one of Einsiedel. Most of the glosses in the commentaries are from Servius, Priscian, Isidorus and others. A. Weidner, *Adversaria Sallustiana*. Progr. Dortmund, 1886. W. Böhme, *Zu Sallustius*. N. Jahr. f. Phil. 137. J. P. Postgate, *Sallustiana*. Mnemos. xiii. Various conj. Weidner not generally happy as Böhme shows in some cases. Postgate's *cedere aliis alios obtruncare* (*Jug.* 97. 5) not approved. J. Binsfeld, *Adversaria Critica*. Festschrift, Coblenz, 1882, various conj. to Cat. In 19. 1 *neque etiam* for *neque tamen*, unnecessarily as *neque tamen* = *sed ne quidem* as elsewhere. H. Jordan, *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der lat. Sprache*. Berlin, 1879. K. Kraut, *Ueber das vulgäre Element in der Sprache des Sallust*. Progr. Blaubereun, 1881. What Jordan points out as traces of oldfashioned modes of speech Kraut considers as vulgar Latin. To the latter all S.'s peculiarities are vulgarisms. To the ancients S. was the imitator of Cato, the lover of old forms, who was terse and rather obscure in expression. C. Hübenal, *Quaestiones de usu infinitivi historici apud Sallustium et Tacitum*. Diss. Halle, 1881. The historical infin. more frequent in S. than in T. The act. much

commoner in all writers than the pass. After *postquam* and *ubi* the hist. inf. stands only for the imperf. F. Uber, *Quaestiones aliquot Sallustianae grammaticae et criticae*. Diss. Göttingen, 1882. F. Grossman. *Ueber den Gebrauch der Kasus bei Sallust*. Progr. Berlin, 1886. O. Christ, *De ablativo Sallustiano*. Diss. Jena, 1883. Wilckens, *Beiträge zu Syntax des Sallust*. Progr. Lehr, 1888. G. treats of all the cases without prepositions, C. the abl. and the prepp. which take the abl., W. the prepp. with the accus. F. Vogel. *Quaestionum Sallustianarum pars altera*. Acta semin. philol. Erlangensis ii. (1881). This continues from Part i. (1878) an interesting account of the imitators of Sallust, viz. Justin, Fronto, the authors of the Augustan history, etc. J. Sellge, *De studiis in Sallustio Crispo a Pompeio Trogo et Justino Epitoma-tore collocatis*. Diss. Breslau, 1882. Th. Opitz. *Sallustius und Aurelius Victor*. N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 127. Brunnert, *Sallust und Dictys Cretensis*. Progr. Erfurt, 1883. J. Robolski, *Sallustius in conformanda oratione quo jure Thucydidis exemplum secutus esse existimetur*. Diss. Halle, 1881. A pity that R. does not see the fruitlessness of the inquiry. Most of the pretended imitations of Thuc. are pure Latin. R. Schild, *Quibus in rebus Sallustius Thucydidem respexit aut respicisse credatur*. Progr. Nordhausen, 1888. More carefully done than Robolski's. A. Nitzschner, *De locis Sallustianis, qui apud scriptores et grammaticos veteres leguntur*. Diss. Göttingen, 1884. 'Careful and diligent.' L. Kuhlmann, *Quaestiones Sallustianae criticae*. Progr. Oldenburg, 1887. Defends the authority of cod. P against the grammarians cited in previous dissertation and mostly with justice. H. Wirz, *Die stoffliche und zeitliche Gliederung des bellum Jugurthinum der Sallust*. Festschrift Zürich, 1887. Chiefly occupied with the dates of the campaigns. H. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Ueber die Reden und Briefe des Sallust*. Leipzig, 1888. Careful and interesting. A comparison of S.'s method with that of other historians in reporting speeches.

III. Contributions from periodicals.—H. Jordan, *De Vaticanis Sallustii historiarum schedis*. Hermes xiv. M. Bonnet, *Die Handschriften von Montpellier H. 360 und Par. lat. 10195*. Hermes xiv. J. S. von Veen, *Sallustianum*. Hermes xxiii. Conj. Cat. 12. 2 *pudorem impudicitiam*. Ad. Hofmeister, *Zur*

Handschriften Kunde des Sallust. Philol. xxxix. An account of a portion of a Sallust MSS. at Rostock. C. Hartung, *Zu Sallust Jug.* 73. 2; 93. 8. Philol. xli. L. Hellwig, *Zu Sallust* and G. Ungermann, *Zu Sallust*. N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 119. On Adherbal's speech (*Jug.* 14). C. Gneisse, *Zu Sallust*, N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 119. On *Jug.* 94. 1. L. Hellwig, *Zu Sallust*. N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 121. On *Jug.* 3. 1 and 2. Th. Opitz, *Zu Sallust*. N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 131. Defends P. in various places. C. John, *Das Verhör der Catilinarier*. N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 131. A. Kunze, *Zu Sallust*. N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 137. On *Jug.* 85. 47. J. P. Postgate, *Sallustianum*. Mnemos. xii. On *Jug.* 78. 2. C. Meiser, *Kritische Bemerkungen zu Sallusts Jugurtha und Catilina*. Bl. f. d. bayer. GSW. 19. and 20. Several futile conj. J. Mähly, *Satura I*. Bl. f. d. bayer. GWS. 24. on Cat. 23, 3 and 36. 5. A. Kornitzer, *Zeitschr. f. d. öst. G.* 1887 on Cat. 52. 20.

Kuhn's Zeitschrift. Band xxxi. Heft 2:—

The classical articles are—Georg von Sabler: *cūcūlus* (distinct from Plautine *cūcūlus*) a compound of *pecu* (*pecu*) and *cūlus*—*pecten* and *crev*. to be connected by an ablaut of declension, *pektēs*, *pektēns*—*χῆρ*, Lat. *er* connected with *ἐχῆρος* and formed with suffix *-er*, with long vowel kept in oblique cases, as in *θηρ*—Idg. *ner-* 'man' is usually assumed to have a prothetic *a* in *ἀνερ* etc., but *ἀνερ* is for *ἰνερ*, assimilated from *ἰνερ*, i.e. *ἰν-er* from root *man*. In the oblique cases the root necessarily appears as *mner-*, (*n*)*ner*—O. Slav. *veselū* 'joyful,' goes with Sk. *valsālā* 'tender,' Lat. *veterinus*—herba is *ghérzdā*, Gk. *κριθή* is *κρῖθῆ*, according to Thurneysen's theory of sonant *z*.—*πᾶν*, Lat. *penis*, from *pnau*—*haereo* for *ghais-cjo*, a derivative from *ghaiso*, Gk. *χαῖος*—*vituperare* formed with prefix *vi-* and root *tup-* in *τύπτω*—*κῆλον*, *per-cellere*, *callum* all go back to a root *gals-* 'to strike'—*στρέβω* is from I.-E. *stengo*, cf. perhaps Lat. *stinguo*—*formus* is to be separated from *θερμός* and referred to a form *bhyormo-* (cf. *Classical Review* iv. p. 485 a) with which *go ferreo* and *furere* (aorist-pres.).—Paul Kretschmer discusses the change of *ā* to *η* in Ionic chiefly with reference to the chronology. Rud. Henning: local names in *-as* in later Latin.—R. Meister: three Boeotian proper names.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

A Dictionary of Classical Antiquities, Mythology, Religion, Literature and Art, from the German of Dr. Oskar Seyffert, revised and edited, with additions, by Professor Nettleship and Dr. Sandys. With numerous Illustrations. Sonnenschein and Co. 21s. [Nearly ready.]

Dr. Sandys has undertaken to prepare for publication by Messrs. Macmillan a critical and explanatory edition of Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Allen (T. W.) Notes on Greek Manuscripts in Italian Libraries. Cr. 8vo. xii, 62 pp. Nutt. 3s. 6d.
Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens. Edited by F. G. Kenyon. 2nd edition. 8vo. lii, 190 pp. British Museum. 7s. 6d.
Belton (R. C.) A Digest of Greek Grammar Examination Questions, arranged alphabetically, with copious explanations, advice, and hints. Post 8vo. 178 pp. Simpkin. 3s.
Brugmann (K.) A Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages. A concise exposition

of the history of Sanskrit, Old Iranian, Old Armenian, Greek, Latin, Umbro-Samnitic, Old Irish, Gothic, Old High German, Lithuanian and Old Church Slavonic. Vol. II. Morphology. Part I. Introduction—Noun-compounds—Reduplicated Nouns—Formative Suffixes—Root-Nouns. Translated from the German by R. Seymour Conway and W. H. D. Rouse. 8vo. xviii, 493 pp. London, D. Nutt. Bound. 16s.
Caesar. De Bello Gallico V. A translation by A. A. Irwin Nesbitt and W. F. Mason. 12mo. Clive. 1s.

- Caesar*. Gallic War. Book VI. With Maps, Notes, Vocabulary, edited by M. J. F. Brackenbury, and exercises for translation by A. Jamson Smith. 12mo. 190 pp. Percival. 1s. 6d.
- Gallic War. VI. Edited by A. H. Allcroft and W. F. Mason. 12mo. Clive. 2s. 6d.
- Hime* (Maurice C.) An Introduction to the Greek Language, comprising Accidence and Syntax, Exercises and Vocabularies, together with hundreds of original Examination Questions on the text, besides tabulated lists of the questions on Greek Grammar set at the Intermediate Examinations 1879 to 1890. 8vo. xxiv, 330 pp. Simpkin & Co. 4s.
- Homer*. *Odyssey*. Book IV. A translation by A. F. Burnet and J. Thompson. 12mo. Clive. 1s. 6d.

- Plauti* Rudens. Edited with critical and explanatory notes by E. A. Sonnenschein. 8vo. xxii, 211 pp. Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d.
- Teuffel's* History of Roman Literature, revised and enlarged by Ludwig Schwabe. Authorised translation from the fifth German edition by G. C. W. Warr. 8vo. xii, 577 pp. Vol. I. The Republican Period. Bell & Sons. 15s.
- Virgil*. *Aeneid*. Books VII.—IX. Edited, with Introduction and Notes by T. L. Papillon and A. E. Haigh. Post 8vo. 140 pp. Frowde. 3s.
- Xenophon*. *Hellenica*. Book I. With Analysis and Notes. By Rev. L. D. Dowdall. 12mo Bell and Sons. 2s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Babrius*. Les fables ésoques de Babrios. Traduites en totalité pour la première fois comparées aux d'Horace et de Phèdre, de Corrozet et de La Fontaine, avec une étude sur leurs origines et leur iconographie par E. Lévêque. Illustrations. Paris, Belin frères.
- Bie* (O.) Kampfgruppe und Kämpfertypen in der Antike. 8vo. iii, 160 pp. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 Mk. 60.
- Büdingen* (M.) Die römischen Spiele und der Patriat, eine historische Untersuchung. [Extract: Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.] 8vo. 74 pp. Illustrations. Wien, Tempsky. 1 Mk. 40.
- Chlingensperg-Berg* (M.) Das Gräberfeld von Reichenhall in Oberbayern. Geöffnet, untersucht, und beschrieben. 4to. v, 164 pp. Maps and 40 plates. Reichenhall, Bühler. 40 Mk.
- Cicero*. *Paradoxa ad M. Brutum*. Erklärt von Max Schneider. 8vo. 84 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz. 1 Mk.
- Cohn* (L.) Wilhelm Studemund. Ein Lebensabriss. [Extract: Biographisches Jahrbuch der Altertums-kunde.] 8vo. 24 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 1 Mk. 20.
- Lydynski* (T.) Beiträge zur handschriftlichen Ueberlieferung der Justinianischen Rechtsquellen. I. Institutionen. Heft 1. 8vo. 112 pp. Berlin, Puttkammer und Mühlbrecht. 2 Mk. 40.
- Euripides*. Dramen. In den Versmassen der Ur-schrift ins Deutsche übersetzt von C. Bruch. Band II. 12mo. Minden, Bruns. iii, 356 pp. 5 Mk.
- [Contents: Hekabe — Die Schutzfliehenden — Herakles—Andromache—Elektra—Helena.]
- Feuillet* (L.) Nouvelle chrestomathie grecque élémentaire à l'usage de la classe de cinquième avec des exercices oraux, des thèmes instantanés et un lexique grec-français rédigé sur un plan nouveau. 6ième édition augmentée et conforme au programme de 1890. 12mo: iv, 107 pp. Paris, Belin frères.
- Gerber and Greef*. *Lexicon Taciteum*. Fasciculus IX. Edidit A. Greef. 8vo. 929-1040 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Each 3 Mk. 60.
- Görres* (G.) Studien zur griechischen Mythologie. 2te Folge. 283 pp. 9 Mk.
- [Extract: Berliner Studien für klassische Philologie und Archäologie. Band XII. Heft 1. 8vo. Berlin, Calvary & Co.]
- Justin* der Märtyrer. Die Apologien herausgegeben von G. Krüger. 8vo. x, 84 pp. Freiburg, Mohr. 1 Mk. 50.
- [Extract: Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften als Grundlage für Seminarübungen herausgegeben von G. Krüger. Heft 1.]
- Kloevekorn* (H.) De proscriptionibus anno ante Christum natum 43 a M. Antonio, M. Aemilio Lepido, C. Julio Caesare Octaviano triumviris factis. Dissertatio. 8vo. 129 pp. Königsberg. 2 Mk.
- Pollack* (E.) *Hippodromica*. 8vo. v, 110 pp. Plate. Leipzig, Ruhl. 2 Mk. 50.
- Programm 50 zum Winckelmannsfeste der archäologischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin. 4to. iii, 172 pp. Plates and illustrations. Berlin, G. Reimer. 11 Mk.
- [Contents: Robert (C.), Homerische Becher. Winter (F.), Ueber ein Vorbild neu-attischer Reliefs. Furtwängler (A.), Ein argivische Bronze. Furtwängler (A.) Orpheus, Attische Vase aus Gela.]
- Reinach* (S.) Peintures de vases antiques recueillies par Millin 1808 et Millingen 1813 publiées et commentées par S. Reinach. 4to. xiv, 146 pp. Plates. Didot et Cie. 30 fr.
- Riemann* (O.) et *Goelzer* (H.) Le deuxième année de latin à l'usage de la classe de cinquième. Théorie, 227 exercices, lexiques. Paris, Colin et Cie. 2 fr. 50.
- Rothe* (C.) Die Bedeutung der Wiederholung für die homerische Frage. [Extract: Festschrift zur Feier des 200-jähr. Bestehens des Französischen Gymnasiums.] 8vo. 123-168 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk. 20.
- Schmalz* (J. H.) und *Wagner* (C.) Lateinische Grammatik nebst Prosodie und allen unregelmässigen Verben. 7te Auflage. 12mo. iii, 132 pp. Berlin, Friedberg und Mode. 50 Pf.
- Schneider* (A.) Prolegomena zu einer neuen Gallerie heroischen Bildwerke. 8vo. 72 pp. Illustrations. Leipzig, Engelmann. 1 Mk. 60.
- Schreiber* (T.) Die hellenistischen Reliefbilder. Lieferungen 6-8. Leipzig, Engelmann. Each 20 Mk.
- Sittl* (K.) Würzburger Antiken erläutert. [23 Programm des von Wagnerschen Kunstinstitutes der Universität Würzburg.] Folio. iii, 21 pp. Plates. Würzburg, Stübel. 4 Mk.
- Sutlerlin* (L.) Zur Geschichte der Verba denominativa im Altgriechischen. Teil I. Die Verba denominativa auf -ω-ω-ω. 8vo. 128 pp. Strassburg, Trübner. 3 Mk.
- Tozer* (H. F.) *Geographica classica*. Traduzioni e note di I. Gentile. Quinta edizione riveduta e corretta. 16mo. 168 pp. Milano, Ulrico Hoepli.
- Vries* (S. G.) *Exercitationes palaeographicas in bibliotheca universitatis Lugduno-Bataviae instaurandas iterum indicit*. [Inest commentationcula de C. Plinii Caecilii sec. epistularum fragmento rossiano notis tironianis descripto.] 8vo. 31 pp. Plate. Leiden, Brill. 2 Mk.